I	1 					
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS					
2	TYLER DIVISION					
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  DOCKET NO. 6:18cr16					
4	-vs- ) Tyler, Texas					
5	) 8:32 a.m. HEON JONG YOO November 15, 2018					
6						
7	TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY					
8	<u>APPEARANCES</u>					
9	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:					
10						
11	MR. LAUREL FRANKLIN COAN, JR. MR. LUCAS R. MACHICEK					
12	MR. RYAN LOCKER ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS					
13	110 North College, Ste. 700 Tyler, Texas 75702					
14	FOR THE DEFENDANT:					
15	MR. HEON JONG YOO PRO SE					
16	101 E. Methvin St., Ste. 559 Longview, Texas 75601					
17	STANDBY COUNSEL:					
18						
19	MR. JEFF LYNN HAAS ATTORNEY AT LAW					
20	100 E. Ferguson, Ste. 908 Tyler, Texas 75702					
21						
22	COURT REPORTER: MS. SHEA SLOAN FEDERAL OFFICIAL REPORTER					
23	211 W. Ferguson Tyler, Texas 75702					
24						
25	Proceedings taken by Machine Stenotype; transcript was produced by computer-aided transcription.					
	1					

1	INDEX					
2	PAGE					
3						
4	OBJECTIONS TO THE CHARGE 4					
5	RULE 29 34					
6						
7	****					
8						
9	WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT					
10	GREGORY HARRY 52					
11						
12	HEON JONG YOO 67 86 102					
13	*****					
14						
15	PAGE					
16						
17	GOVERNMENT AND DEFENDANT REST 106					
18	JURY CHARGE 110					
19	CLOSING ARGUMENT: BY MR. MACHICEK 127					
20	CLOSING ARGUMENT: BY MR. YOO 141					
21	CLOSING ARGUMENT: BY MR. COAN 156					
22	VERDICT OF THE JURY 165					
23						
24						
25						

					3		
1	FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS						
2							
3				PAGE			
4	OPENING STATEMENT:	BY MR. YOO		168			
5							
6	*****						
7	WITNESS	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT			
8	JAMES REED	169	172				
9		200	_ , _				
10	*****						
11	FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS EXHIBIT INDEX						
12	GOVERNMENT'S						
13		DESCR.	IPTION		PAGE		
14	28 PARA 1911 EXPERT 171 .45 CALIBER PISTOL						
15	29	AMMUN			171		
16							
17	******						
18				PAGE			
19							
20	JURY CHARGE			177			
21	CLOSING ARGUMENT:	BY MR. LOCK	ER	180			
22	CLOSING ARGUMENT:	BY MR. YOO		181			
23	VERDICT			184			
24	TRIAL CONCLUDED			192			
25							

## PROCEEDINGS

(Defendant present - Jury out.)

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning to everyone.

We are on the record. It is about 8:30. We need to address jury instructions and anything else that needs to be dealt with before we begin with the jury at 9:00 o'clock.

I know the parties have exchanged instructions, and I don't have any particular preference about what we start with or who starts. I know Mr. Yoo has provided some instructions with respect to Count 8, and I know the Government has -- has provided instructions on all of the counts.

So, whoever wants to begin, may do so.

MR. YOO: Sir, I have filed instructions on Count 1 through 7 too.

THE COURT: Okay. I think those -- my sense, general sense, is the instructions on Counts 1 through 7 were essentially agreed. I didn't see really any substantive differences. I think the main disputes between the parties concern Count 8. Am I wrong about that?

MR. YOO: No, sir -- yes, sir, you are actually wrong about that. The main -- main difference in terms of jury instructions concerning Count 1 through 7.

THE COURT: Okay. Well then, let me hear from you, Mr. Yoo.

1.5

MR. YOO: All right. So when I examined the proposed instructions by Frank Coan -- lawyer Frank Coan, Lucas Machicek, and D. Ryan Locker, all three of them, right? They state that -- say that Section 924(a)(1)(a) makes it a -- sorry. Count 1 through 7 of Superseding Indictment charges the Defendant Heon Jong Yoo with making false statement with respect to information required to be kept by a federal fire -- firearms licensee in violation of 18 USC 924(a)(1)(A).

And then it proceeds on saying Title 18, United States Code, Section 924(a)(1)(A) makes it a crime for anyone to knowingly make any false statement or representation with respect to the information required by this chapter to be kept in the record of a person licensed under this chapter or in applying for any license or exemption or relief from disability under the provisions of this chapter.

And then it states that federal law requires licensed dealers to record every firearm transaction to an unlicensed individual on a firearm transaction record known as the ATF Form 4473. Federally licensed firearm dealers are also required to maintain each ATF Form 4473 obtained in the course of transferring the custody to -- of firearms.

For you to find the Defendant guilty of these crimes, you must be convinced that the Government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant made a false statement in the ATF Form 4473.

Second, that the Defendant made a statement to a federally -- federally licensed firearm dealer. Third, that the Defendant knew that the statement was false.

Statement -- a statement is false if it was untrue when it was made.

And then he said, see 18 USC 924(a)(1)(A), 27 CFR 478.124, Alpha and Bravo. Abramski vs. United States, yeah.

First of all, let me address defect of the visa references. 27 CFR 478.124 states: The manner of federal firearms licensee -- I mean, manner of the ATF 4473 forms to be kept under federally licensed firearm dealers and basically FFLs. I am -- this is not --

All right. 924(a)(1)(A), the code does not state anything about 4473, and I am not challenging the fact that 4473 forms are required to be kept by the federal firearm licensing.

THE COURT: Then why are these two sentences that you are concerned about important?

MR. YOO: Because he completely omitted the first part, "informations required to be kept." Those are very specific, sir. "Informations required to be kept."

So -- and --

THE COURT: But help me understand why that makes a

difference, Mr. Yoo. You have to explain why that matters.
You have not done that yet.

MR. YOO: I have -- I have done it, sir. The charge is not -- not about -- the charge is not -- not about the form itself. The charge does not say any false information on the ATF 4473 form. The charge states information required to be kept on the 4473 -- no, information required to be kept by the records of FFL. The charge itself does not state anything about 4473.

Now, Mr. Coan is purely focusing on the -- on the Form 4473, and he even stated on the jury instruction, federal law requires licensed dealers to record every firearm transaction -- this is redundant, and this is even misleading, you know.

THE COURT: How?

MR. YOO: Again, the charge -- the code,

924(a)(1)(A) does not state anyone about the 4473. And so my

proposed jury -- my proposed references are, yeah, I mean, he

can keep 27 CFR 478.124, but he also needs to include 27 CFR

478.125.

And that specifically defines records -- specific records -- no. Specific information required to be kept within the records. It lists out.

Also, Abramski vs. United States is about strawman purchase. In a strawman purchase Abramski gave wrong name,

1.5

wrong address, and wrong date of birth, which should have been Alvarez's name, Alvarez's date of birth, and Alvarez's address.

Yes, one of -- it says section. I actually have the whole LexisNexis note about Abramski vs. United States. One of its -- its sections does state that, you know, any information required to be kept pertaining to ATF 4473 form makes it illegal. That -- Abramski got convicted of 924(a)(1)(A) because he gave false name, false address, and false date of birth because his name, his address, and his date of birth is different from Alvarez.

And then he got convicted of 922(a)(6) because he answered fraudulently on -- on answering 11A, 11 Alfa of the ATF Form 4473. Are you the actual buyer and transferrer of the firearm? No. In this case Alvarez was the actual transferrer and the buyer of the firearm.

So that -- and the -- Coan also completely omitted 18 USC, Section 922(b)(5). And that code specifically describes word by word information required to be kept. I mean you can't -- you can't dispute that, sir, because that is what it states. I am just -- I am just stating -- I am just stating what it states, so this is my proposed jury instructions regarding 123.

One, the Defendant made false statements to an FFL.

Two, the false statements regarding -- no. Sorry.

1.5

The false statements were regarding information required to be kept by FFL records pursuant to this chapter.

Three, the Defendant knew it was false.

I mean, that sounds fair, right? I mean, then the jury can decide which informations are required to be kept.

I only have minor disputes when it comes to Count 8.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from  $\operatorname{Mr.}$  Coan.

MR. COAN: Your Honor, good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. COAN: Just for the purposes of the record, we have submitted -- United States has submitted a complete set of proposed jury instructions. The only non-pattern, meaning non-Fifth-Circuit pattern charges, proposed charges, are 22, 23, and the unanimity, proposed unanimity charge No. 24.

With respect to proposed jury instruction No. 22 which would go to Counts 1 through 7, as the Court is aware, the Fifth Circuit does not have a pattern instruction on this particular substantive offense.

The United States researched the issue and proposed a jury instruction that is adapted from the pattern charges in the Eighth and the Eleventh Circuit. It correctly states the law. Federal law does require the licensed dealers to create and maintain the ATF Form 4473. And, therefore, it is

a record that is required to be kept by the dealers.

My biggest concern with the -- and I understand that the citations that we -- that are contained in our proposed instructions and that are contained in the Defendant's instructions are not part of the final charge.

And so whatever -- whatever he may cite or whatever the United States may cite is not going to be seen by the jury. That is simply to advise the Court of where the authority from which these proposed charges are drawn.

My biggest concern with the Defendant's proposed instruction is -- was stated perfectly by the Defendant.

And, that is, he would like to argue a question of law to the jury. And, that is, to ask them to make a determination as to whether an ATF Form 4473 is a record that is required to be kept by the licensed dealer. That is a question of law for the Court.

MR. YOO: Objection. I wasn't disputing that -THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, let Mr. Coan finish.

MR. COAN: So my concern about the Defendant's charge is, without including specific reference to the ATF Form 4473, then implicitly that is going to permit the Defendant to argue that something other than the ATF Form 4473 is required to be kept by the federally licensed dealers. That is not the state of the law. That could create confusion for the jury. And so that is why there

1.5

is -- primarily why there is a distinction between the Government's proposed charge, No. 22, and the Defendant's proposed instruction for Counts 1 through 7.

On the legal argument -- and let me back up a little bit, a little housekeeping. The Defendant's Standby Counsel provided the United States with a copy of a motion, a Rule 29 motion yesterday evening. It was never filed.

The United States prepared a written response, and we did not file it because the way ECF works, I have to be able to link it to a motion. That was submitted to the Court Clerk this morning. And arguments on this issue are contained in the -- in the Government's response brief.

The 922(b)(5) and the 478.125 regulation that Mr. Yoo is relying on for this argument that he wants to try to make to the jury that the 4473 is not required or that some information less than what is included in the 4473 is what is actually required, is -- offbase.

922(b)(5) and 478.125 relate to a totally separate record. Those are the acquisition and disposition records that Mr. Freese testified about the other day. They are records that are in addition to the ATF Form 4473.

Those records do not -- they don't negate the Form 4473, they don't limit the Form 4473. They are in addition to the Form 4473 and are records that the licensed dealers are required to keep.

1.5

What is required to be kept for the purposes of this case and this charge under 924(a)(1)(A) are the ATF Forms 4473.

With respect to Abramski, certainly recognize that the false statements, the specific false statements that were charged in that case are factually different than the false statements that are charged in this case.

However, the Defendants in that case made the precise argument that the Defendant is raising here. And, that is, that the information contained in Section A was not required to be kept by the licensed dealer. And the Supreme Court said that is incorrect. Everything on the Form 4473 is required to be kept. Nothing in that opinion relies upon 18 USC 922(b)(5) or 27 CFR 478.125.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Yoo, short response?

MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Would you take a look at Abramski vs. United States yourself? And it repeatedly mentions 922(b)(5) as reference to information required to be kept.

And I was not disputing the fact that ATF -- sorry, not -- not ATF, FFL dealers are required to keep ATF Form 4473. That was -- that was not in the -- like that was not in the -- in the question. I wasn't objecting to that. I know that ATF Form 4473 are required to be kept by FFL

dealers I believe for 20 years. Yes. So -- but --1 THE COURT: Was there a suggestion --2 MR. YOO: Sir -- sir. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo --4 MR. YOO: May I please explain? 5 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead. 6 MR. YOO: Yeah. Please, please, please do not 7 object for the Prosecution. 8 So, yeah, the charge -- if I read the charge 9 10 924(a)(1)(A) word by word, it is knowingly makes any false statement or representation with respect to the information 11 required by this chapter to be kept in the record of a person 12 licensed under this chapter or in applying for any license or 13 exemption or relief from disability under the provisions of 14 1.5 this chapter. It does not specifically state anything about ATF 16 17 Form 4473. It does, however, state -- specifically state information -- information required to be -- required by this 18 chapter to be kept in the records of a person licensed under 19 20 this chapter. So all I'm saying is -- all I'm saying is let's go 21 22 by the word -- word -- letter and the color of the law in the section, 18 United States Code 924(a)(1)(A) and put that 23 exact letter and color of the law in the jury instruction and 24 let the jury decide. 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Actually, Abramski vs. United States, this LexisNexis note, this is -- this is how I found out 922(b)(5), and also I have only minor dispute regarding the Count 8. THE COURT: Hold on just a minute, Mr. Yoo, before we get there. Was there a proposed sentence that you suggested be included in the instruction on Counts 1 through 7 that was not contained in the Government's proposal? MR. YOO: Yes. I would like the -- first of all, I -- I would like the -- the Government's proposal to be stricken actually. But --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, we are past that point. have told me that there was a sentence that you wanted added that the Government had not included in its proposal and that -- it was my understanding that that would satisfy you. Can you tell me, number one, is that not right? MR. YOO: Sir, not added. THE COURT: I'm sorry? MR. YOO: Not added. Corrected. THE COURT: All right. Well, what was the sentence you proposed? MR. YOO: One, the Defendant made false statements to an FFL. Two, the false statements were regarding

```
information required to be kept by FFL records pursuant to
1
 2
    this chapter.
               Three, the Defendant knew it was false. I mean,
 3
    that is pretty straightforward, and we can let the jury
 4
 5
    decide.
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, we are not communicating, sir.
 6
7
    I am talking about in the instruction itself --
               MR. YOO: Instruction itself.
 8
               THE COURT: Right. So Counts 1 through 7 --
 9
10
              MR. YOO: All right.
               THE COURT: -- if you would look at --
11
               MR. YOO: I was -- I was --
12
13
               THE COURT: -- if you would look at the
    Government's proposed jury instruction No. 22.
14
              MR. YOO: I am looking at it, sir.
15
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
              MR. YOO: So do you see the first -- the second
    paragraph which starts with Title 18?
18
               THE COURT: I do.
19
20
              MR. YOO: Okay. So go down to the chapter and the
              And then do you see the federal law requires --
21
    period.
22
               THE COURT: I do.
               MR. YOO: -- section?
23
               THE COURT: I do.
24
              MR. YOO: Yes. That is redundant and significantly
25
```

```
misleading. I mean --
1
               THE COURT: Okay. Hold on.
 2
               MR. YOO: That is for the jury --
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo. So it is the last two
 4
 5
    sentences of the second paragraph of the Government's
    proposed jury instruction No. 2 -- 22 that you have a problem
 6
    with; is that correct?
 7
               MR. YOO: Yes, I do believe --
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. So do you have something to -- a
 9
    sentence that you wanted to add before those twenty -- before
10
    those last two sentences that would satisfy you.
11
              MR. YOO: No.
                              Those -- that sentence must -- must
12
    be taken out because that is not -- that is not for the
13
    Prosecution to decide. That is for the jury to decide.
14
               THE COURT: Well, the jury is not going to decide
15
    what federal law requires. That is a question of law.
16
              MR. YOO: I understand, but the law -- exactly the
17
    law -- law itself, 924 -- 18, United States Code 924(a)(1)(A)
18
    states, "information required to be kept." I mean,
19
    that -- that is the law, sir.
20
               So I am just saying that in the proposed jury
21
    instruction, let's strictly go by the law, not add -- not add
22
    my interpretation to it, not add Frank Coan's interpretation
23
    to it, not add anyone's interpretation to it.
24
25
               THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
MR. YOO: Let's just go by the letter of the law.
 1
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 2
               MR. YOO: That's all I'm saying, sir.
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yoo.
 5
               Mr. Coan, explain to me why those two sentences are
 6
     necessary.
 7
               MR. COAN: We can take them out, so long as the
     first element is that the Defendant made a false statement in
 8
     the ATF Form 4473.
 9
10
               THE COURT: I think that is -- does that satisfy
     you, Mr. Yoo?
11
               MR. YOO: Huh?
12
13
               THE COURT: Does that satisfy you?
               MR. YOO: Pardon? If they take these two sentences
14
15
     out, yes, it satisfies me. But --
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
               MR. YOO: -- they also have to change the first,
     second, and third --
18
               THE COURT: First, second, and third --
19
               MR. YOO: -- section. You know, for you to find
20
     the Defendant guilty of these crimes, you must be convinced
21
22
     that the Government has proved each of the following beyond a
     reasonable doubt. First, second, and third. I mean,
23
    changed.
24
               First, the -- the -- the Defendant made false
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
statements to a FFL. I mean, yeah, that is the letter and
color of the law.
          THE COURT: Well, it is the form that you made the
statements on, right?
          MR. YOO: Right. But the form is not the charge.
          THE COURT: Okay.
          MR. YOO: Second, the false statements were
regarding information required to be kept by FFL records
pursuant to this chapter. That is just straightforward.
There is no misleading there. There is no deception there.
          Third, the Defendant knew it was false. I mean --
hey, I mean, do you want me to read out 924(a)(1)(A) --
          THE COURT: No.
          MR. YOO: -- again?
          THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I think I understand what your
position is.
         MR. YOO: Yeah.
          THE COURT: So --
          MR. YOO: That is pretty straightforward, isn't it?
          THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yoo.
          Mr. Coan?
                    The proposed jury instruction No. 22
         MR. COAN:
already recites Section 924(a)(1)(A) including the language
that the Defendant wants to be included. The ATF Form 4473
is, in fact, required to be kept in the records of a person
```

licensed under this chapter.

MR. YOO: Did I dispute that?

MR. COAN: He doesn't seem to disagree with it. I am not sure what the objection is to the first element in the proposed instruction No. 22.

THE COURT: What is the dispute?

MR. YOO: My objection is that is not -- that is not what the charge states. The charge states information required to be kept in the FFL record. The charge is very specific.

MR. COAN: Well, actually, the code section is recited in proposed jury instruction No. 22. That should address the Defendant's concerns.

The Superseding Indictment charges him with making a false statement in the ATF Form 4473, which is required to be kept in records of the licensed dealer.

MR. YOO: Yeah, but --

MR. COAN: Again, I am not following what the objection is to the first element.

MR. YOO: Is the jury going to see the code? Is the jury going to see the code -- unaltered code -- code -- code itself? Unaltered and non -- non-misleading code. I mean basically the code itself, not the code that you changed and give them. As long as the jury is going to see -- I mean, yeah, if -- if the jury is going to see the actual 18

USC, Section 924 like this (indicating) --

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, you have been provided with a copy of the Government's proposed instructions, and you have had an opportunity to provide proposed instructions of your own. And so I am trying to sort of navigate those two.

Mr. Coan has offered to take out those two sentences in the second paragraph of proposed instruction No. 22 to satisfy your concerns.

I think I understand what the argument is. We are going to go ahead and proceed with discussion on Count No. 8. And then we are going to start with the jury at 9:00 o'clock, which is just a few minutes from now.

MR. YOO: Sir --

THE COURT: So I am going to reserve ruling --

MR. YOO: Sir --

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I am speaking now. I am going to make a decision based upon the argument of Counsel and your argument, Mr. Yoo, and I will make a determination this morning about how the Court will instruct the jury, and I will provide you with a copy of that and give you an opportunity to put any remaining objections you have on the record.

Now, with --

MR. YOO: So, just to be clear --

THE COURT: With respect to Count 8, what are your

concerns?

MR. YOO: Before we proceed, just to be clear, you also got the one, two, and three for the Counts 1 through 7, right?

THE COURT: I understand what your argument is.

MR. YOO: Okay. Good.

For Count 8, I just want the -- the -- on the second part, you know, the -- on the specific first, second, and third instructions, that before the Defendant possessed the firearm, the Defendant had been committed to a mental institution in accordance with the federal definition of commitment. 27 CFR, Section 478.11.

And on the reference section, I would like for y'all -- you -- I would like for you to include public law 110180, NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007.

The letter and color of the law in there is pretty clear, sir. I mean -- I mean, it literally states the standard for commitment.

THE COURT: So do you have a case that you can cite me from the Fifth Circuit or any other circuit in the United States that supports your position on this, Mr. Yoo?

MR. YOO: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear it.

MR. YOO: So I mostly focused on -- on case laws after NICS Improvement Amendments Act had been enacted.

```
But -- but from the Fifth Circuit there is United States vs.
1
     Giardina.
 2
               THE COURT: Yes, and I have read Giardina. How
 3
 4
     does that case support your position?
 5
               MR. YOO: Because that case law states that --
     Giardina's -- Giardina's conviction was reversed because
 6
    he -- he has never been -- been through a formal hearing.
 7
               THE COURT: Under Louisiana law.
 8
               MR. YOO: I understand, but we are -- 922(g)(4) is
 9
     a federal law here.
10
              Are you objecting on behalf of the Prosecution,
11
     sir?
12
               THE COURT: No, I am trying to understand your
13
     argument here because Giardina refers to Louisiana law, and
14
     the law involved in this case is New Jersey law.
1.5
               MR. YOO: What about --
16
               THE COURT: And all of that testimony came in
17
     yesterday without objection from you.
18
               MR. YOO: I actually raised several
19
20
     counter-arguments when -- when she was testifying about the
     New Jersey law, sir. I have specifically pointed out that
21
     this concerns federal law. This -- this -- this does
22
     not -- not concern New Jersey law.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. So tell me how the Giardina case
24
25
     supports you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YOO: Sir. You do not -- you do not cut Mr. Coan off this way, sir. THE COURT: No, I am asking you to tell me how does the Giardina case support you? MR. YOO: Giardina case -- Giardina's conviction was reversed because he has not been through a formal hearing. Also, I have other cases. United States vs. Rehlander, 2012, 666 F.3d 45. And it --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I have read the Rehlander case too. So go ahead and tell me how it supports you. MR. YOO: I was about to explain, sir. THE COURT: Okay. In Rehlander case -- in Rehlander case, MR. YOO: Rehlander argues that it is unconstitutional to -- to permanently deprive someone of their Second Amendment right to bear arms without the proper due process, so it was violation of his Second Amendment rights and Fifth Amendment rights, and this case is after -- this case is after the enactment of NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007. So he argued that there are two processes in, I believe Maine -- yeah. One is just -- just like what I received, quote, unquote, the temporary commitment order which is actually a temporary confinement and a summons for the actual involuntary commitment hearing.

1 Now --THE COURT: Was that the evidence -- was that the 2 testimony? 3 MR. YOO: What? 4 THE COURT: Was that the testimony? 5 MR. YOO: From who? 6 THE COURT: From the witnesses, that it was a 7 temporary commitment order? 8 MR. YOO: Larsen. Sir, Larsen -- Larsen proved to 9 be completely incompetent of federal law, sir. 10 THE COURT: So was the testimony that the events in 11 New Jersey resulted in a temporary commitment order --12 MR. YOO: That's what Larsen --13 THE COURT: That's what you just told me. 14 MR. YOO: That's what Larsen stated. I mean -- I 15 mean -- I am just going by what -- what -- what Larsen 16 17 stated, sir. I am not testifying right now, you know. I'm just saying. But -- but what I am saying is, in the United 18 States vs. Rehlander, his conviction was also reversed 19 20 because he has not been through an actual adversary 21 proceeding, and he argued that an ex parte communication 22 between the psychiatrist and the Court does not -- does not 23 provide the ground for permanent -- permanent deprivation of Second Amendment right. 24 25 And there is one more case, sir, United States vs.

McIlwain, 2014. In that case the Defendant's conviction was 1 affirmed because he had been through a formal hearing. 2 have not -- I have never been through a formal hearing, sir. 3 4 And on the -- on the RUPD reports, it clearly 5 states that I was transported there voluntarily. And that -- that -- that 2013-04-05, that case had been the 6 7 poisonous tree. Everything else are basically the fruits. mean -- hold on. Hold on. Let me talk to my Standby Counsel 8 for a second. 9 10 (Pause in proceedings.) MR. YOO: After this argument, I would like to make 11 a Rule 29 motion. 12 THE COURT: Well, the jury is waiting. 13 So do you have anything else you want to say about the instructions? 14 15 MR. YOO: Instructions in terms of Count 8, yes. would like for y'all to add -- on the reference section 16 17 United States vs. Rehlander, 27 CFR 478.11, and Addington vs. Texas. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 20 MR. YOO: On the Addington --THE COURT: Mr. Coan, short response. 21 Thank you, Your Honor. The Government's 22 MR. COAN: proposed jury instruction No. 23 is adapted from Fifth 23 Circuit Pattern Jury Instruction No. 2.43D, which is the 24 possession of firearm by a convicted felon. Also a 922(g) 25

offense.

As the Court is aware, whether the Defendant possesses the prohibiting characteristic that would trigger application of 922(g) is a question of law for the Court.

The fact -- for example, in the prior conviction context, whether that conviction qualifies as a felony -- as a crime of punishment for more than one year would be a question of law for the Court whether the conviction existed. The fact of that conviction is the question for the jury.

The Government is concerned with the Defendant's proposed instruction with this, in accordance with the federal definition of commitment. It is asking the jury to make a determination of law.

And so we can argue that determination of law and I am happy to do that and address Giardina and Rehlander and McIlwain; but for the purposes of the charge itself, the United States' objection to the Defendant's proposed instruction is this language that talks about "in accordance with the federal definition of commitment"

MR. YOO: There is a core difference between collaterally attacking the prior felony conviction with -- with my case. I mean -- I mean, honestly, I believe that even -- even permanently depriving anyone of possessing a firearm is completely unconstitutional.

However, the key difference between collaterally

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

attacking felony conviction is that a felon -- convicted felon had served -- either had been served proper due process pursuant to the Fifth Amendment of our Constitution through either bench trial or jury trial, and -- and had been informed of right to appeal and had been through adequate representation by counsel of his choice or -- or by him or her representing his or herself. However in my case there was no due process. is strictly ex parte communication that --THE COURT: Is there any dispute that it was actually formal court order of commitment? MR. YOO: Sir --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, can you answer my question? Is there any dispute about that? MR. YOO: Yes. THE COURT: All right. What is the dispute? MR. YOO: What is the -- what is the difference between a temporary confinement and a formal commitment? THE COURT: What is the dispute with my statement that there was a formal court order of commitment arising out of New Jersey? That was not a formal court order, sir. MR. YOO: THE COURT: Why not? MR. YOO: Because I wasn't served a proper due I had not been through an adversary hearing. And process.

1.5

I -- that order was issued strictly -- strictly through an ex parte -- ex parte communication, which the hospital staff lied.

The police report strictly states that Yoo did not threaten to harm -- harm anyone specifically. That is what it -- is stated in the police report. However, I don't know where -- where Yoo threatened to shoot his RA came from.

Also, among the hospital reports for 2015 they say that I had been -- been, what, like committed to a mental institution for homicidal threats back in 2011 in New Jersey? I was never in New Jersey in 2011, sir. I was -- I was attending an international school in South Korea.

So that entire incident -- those entire two incidents -- incidents resulted from fraudulent hospital reports. And also, what is the point of screening the patients if the patients -- if what the patients tell the screeners are completely disregarded, and those -- those screeners come in with pre-judgment anyway.

THE COURT: Okay. So perhaps you didn't receive an adversarial hearing --

MR. YOO: Yes, I have never --

THE COURT: Hold on.

MR. YOO: -- received an adversarial hearing.

THE COURT: And it may have been ex parte, but wasn't the testimony that you were examined by two different

screeners before the Court reviewed and made the recommendation.

1.5

MR. YOO: Those screeners never took my -- my statements into account. What is -- sir, sir, what is the purpose of even screening patients if -- if the patients' statements would be completely disregarded?

And also are you saying that the screeners are always truthful, and that they don't lie? And are you saying that RUPD reports and the hospital reports do not contradict each other? And are you saying that I wasn't voluntarily admitted pursuant to RUPD reports? Because the facts are pretty clear, sir.

And, sir, you as a Federal Judge needs to be the champion of the United States Constitution. You know the -- due process is solidly defined in the Fifth Amendment of our Constitution.

THE COURT: Well, let me make some comments about 8. I don't think the law -- I mean, I have read the cases that you cited to me Mr. Yoo, the Giardina case out of the Fifth Circuit, the Rehlander case out of the First Circuit. And the McIlwain case out of the Eleventh Circuit, I think.

The McIlwain case contains a fairly good survey of other circuits' decisions.

With respect to the Giardina case, as I understand it, the Fifth Circuit vacated a Section 922(g)(4) conviction,

as you said, when they held that the individual had not been committed under the meaning of the Louisiana statute.

That Defendant had been detained for two weeks of mental health treatment under the order of a physician, and the Fifth Circuit held that an essential element of the 924 section was a formal commitment, which in Louisiana and under Louisiana law required a formal action by a state district court.

The Giardina case cited the Hansel case, which was an earlier case out of the Eighth Circuit where that Court reversed a conviction under the predecessor to 922(g) where the Defendant had been hospitalized pursuant to a county mental health board order.

And, although the order did result in a temporary hospitalization, the Eighth Circuit held that it was not a commitment under the statute because it did not comply with the two-step formal process under Nebraska law. And what the Eighth Circuit said in that case, which is cited with approval by the Fifth Circuit in the Giardina case, is that there is nothing in 18 USC 922(h), the predecessor to 922(g), which indicates an intent to prohibit the possession of firearms by persons who had been hospitalized for observation and examination where they were found not to be mentally ill. The statute makes it clear that a commitment is required.

And, as I said, the Fifth Circuit cites with

approval that language from the Eighth Circuit.

1.5

So one possible compromise here is to instruct the jury slightly differently on Count 8 from either the Government's proposal or the Defendant's proposal. And it is as follows:

First, the Defendant knowingly possessed a firearm as charged in the Superseding Indictment.

Second, that the Defendant had been committed to a mental institution before the Defendant possessed the firearm.

And, third, that the firearm possessed traveled in interstate commerce.

And then we would instruct the jury that, as a matter of law, Count 8 does not include a person who is hospitalized for observation and examination where they were not found to be mentally ill.

And my goal in proposing that instruction is, I think, satisfies the Government's desire that the jury make a determination about whether there was commitment to a mental institution, and yet it allows you, Mr. Yoo, to make your arguments with respect to the ATF regulations.

How does that sound?

MR. YOO: That sounds -- that actually sounds like a good compromise, especially -- especially considering the fact that I have actually, you know -- when you said found

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not to be mentally ill. I was never ordered to be put -- put under any form -- form -- sorry, ordered to be put under any formal treatment, so, yeah --THE COURT: Could you live with that, Mr. Yoo? MR. YOO: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Coan, could the Government live with that? MR. COAN: Your Honor, I apologize. I wasn't taking good enough notes as to the precise language. If the Court -- if we could talk about the exact language. Here is my concern, again, for record purposes, Your Honor, is that it would be asking the jury to make a determination that is really left to the Court, and that is whether the Defendant had been committed to a mental institution under applicable law. THE COURT: Well, I mean, that is --That is my only concern. MR. COAN: THE COURT: -- at some level, Mr. Coan, that is what the Government's instruction does. The Government's proposal was that before the Defendant possessed the firearm the Defendant had been committed to a mental institution. And I think that's, as I understand the Government's suggestion, that is a question of fact that the jury can make a determination about, based on the testimony

of the witnesses yesterday and the documents that have been

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

admitted into evidence from Middlesex County, New Jersey, and Mr. Yoo's anticipated testimony this morning. MR. COAN: Again, expressing it for record purposes, Your Honor. THE COURT: I understand. Well, let me suggest this: You all maybe visit among yourselves. It satisfies Mr. Yoo's concerns. See if you all can live with it. I do think in some respects the precise issue that Mr. Yoo, certainly in the Fifth Circuit, raises, is very close to being an issue of first impression. And I have not been cited to cases from any other circuit by either side that are really on point. I have read all of the cases, as I have indicated, and I think the argument is slightly different here. So with those preliminary comments, I look forward to having your -- having your thoughts about those. So let me suggest that, Mr. Yoo, you are getting ready to take the stand, I understand, and testify? MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Before all that, I would like to make the Rule 29 motion. THE COURT: All right. MR. YOO: Before Rule 29 regarding the instruction, I have just got state one -- one -- one more phrase for the record. NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, Title 1,

Charlie, 1, Charlie -- no. Title 1 Section 101 Charlie 1 1 Charlie. 2 Thank you. 3 Okay. Motion for judge of acquittal -- hold on. 4 5 (Attorney conference the record.) MR. COAN: Your Honor, may I respond very briefly 6 on the NICS Improvement Amendments Act? 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 MR. COAN: I had tried to make clear yesterday in 9 10 one of our bench conferences that, with respect to defining "committed to a mental institution," that legislation is 11 irrelevant. The definition within the legislation refers 12 back to 922(g)(4), and we have cited the legislative history 13 in our response to the Defendant's Rule 29 motion that makes 14 15 clear that it was Congress's intent to leave the law with respect to 922(g)(4) unchanged. 16 17 MR. YOO: Objection. He actually did not refute any of my claims whether to NICS Improvement Amendments Act 18 of 2007 that defines standards of commitment pursuant to the 19 letter and color of the law. 20 And, yeah, I would like to proceed with Rule 29 21 22 motion. THE COURT: Very briefly, Mr. Yoo. 23 MR. YOO: Motion of judgment of acquittal. So I am 24

charged with seven counts of violation 18 United States Code,

25

Section 924(a)(1)(A), false statement with regard to information required to be kept a FFL, and one count violation of 18 United States Code, Section 922(g)(4), possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, by a person who has been committed to a mental institution.

I contend that a violation of 18 United States

Code, 924(a)(1)(A), requires the -- requires the Prosecution

to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that I provided false

information either in the record of receipt or disposition or

in the AT -- and in the ATF Form 4473, specifically false

information -- false specific informations in the form.

Yeah. And in the ATF record, said information being required

to be kept by law. The false information alleged to be

provided is that -- that I stated that I was a United States

citizen, when, in fact, I was not a United States citizen.

But I contend that -- that pursuant to 27 -- 27 CFR the code -- code of federal regulation, Section 478.125, it does not state anything -- so, like, it does not mention the word "citizenship" at all.

And also, pursuant to 18 United States Code, 922

Bravo 5, it specifically states if -- required to be kept

pursuant to this chapter; name, date of birth, and the place

of residence. This is also mentioned in Abramski vs. United

States -- code -- numerous times that the Prosecution cited

to -- to refute my argument, numerous times.

1.5

So that -- that -- that the -- that the evidence shows that -- that the false statements were -- were made, you know. However, it wasn't -- it wasn't -- it wasn't regarding information required to be kept to sustain a conviction on -- on the charge of 18 United States Code, Section 924 Alfa, 1, Alfa pursuant to the letter and the color of the law.

Also, there is no -- there is no intent of deception here because if I intended to deceive, first of all, I would not have admitted my firearm possession to any of the law enforcement that has visited my premise. Also, I will not be visiting a federal firearm licensee dealer. I would have bought guns from -- bought like altered guns from like the back of the trunk, prohibited -- that is not the case here.

I did fill out those ATF Form 4473, and the only two sections that the -- I actually stated the false statements were the place of birth and country of citizenship, which has -- which has no effect in law enforcement's ability to track me down or -- if a violent crime was to occur.

On the -- also -- sorry. I also contend that -- that -- that the evidence is legally insufficient to obtain conviction for a violation of 18 United States Code, Section 922 Golf 4, pursuant to the NICS Improvement

Amendments Act, Section 101 Charlie 1 Charlie for the standards for commitment and adjudication because it was purely a medical finding. I had not had opportunity to have an adversary hearing, and that my due process was not served properly.

And pursuant to United States vs. Rehlander, 666

F -- sorry, 666 Foxtrot 3 Delta 45, First Circuit, 2012, and
United States vs. Giardina, 6 -- sorry, 5th 61 Foxtrot 2

Delta 1334, Fifth Circuit, 1989, the evidence was not sufficient to sustain that it was a formal commitment pursuant to 27 federal -- code of federal regulations,

Section 478.11.

And the person who testified on that behalf yesterday, Dr. Larsen, she said that she is completely incomp -- she did admit that she is completely incompetent in terms of federal gun laws and the federal standards for mental health -- sorry, commitment -- committed to the mental institution.

So, therefore, I respectfully request this

Honorable Court to uphold the Constitution of the United

States and enter an order of acquittal so I can get back to

my -- my life.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yoo.

Mr. Coan, you filed a written response that has not yet been docketed. I have been provided a copy of it. I

1.5

assume when Mr. Yoo gets his written motion filed on the docket, you will get the Government's response added to the docket as well. But would you like to be heard briefly now on the Defendant's motion?

MR. COAN: Certainly, Your Honor.

In Counts 1 through 7, the Defendant has been charged with making any false statement or representation with respect to information required by Chapter 44 of the United States Code.

The elements required for the Government to establish with proof beyond a reasonable doubt are that the Defendant made a false statement with respect to information required to be kept by the licensed dealers.

Two, the Defendant made the statement to a federally licensed firearms dealer.

And, three, the Defendant knew the statement was false.

The Defendant has not challenged the sufficiency of the Government's evidence as to any of these elements.

Instead, what he argues is that the country of citizenship information is not required to be kept by the federally licensed firearms dealer, and that is simply incorrect.

Section 923(g)(1)(A) requires a licensed dealer to maintain such records of sale or other disposition of firearms at his place of business for such period and in such

form as the attorney general may by regulations prescribe.

Under 27 CFR 478.124, subsection (a), the attorney general requires a licensed dealer to record every firearm transaction to an unlicensed individual on a firearms transaction record, that is, a Form 4473. This form includes information about the prospective buyer's country of citizenship. Reference to 27 CFR 478.124, subsection (c).

The dealer is required to retain as part of the required records each Form 4473 obtained in the course of transferring custody of the firearms. That is 27 CFR 478.124, subsection (b).

Under Abramski vs. United States, all of the information required by the ATF Form 4473 is information required to be kept for the purposes of Section 924(a)(1)(A).

To the Defendant's statutory argument, the language of Section 922(b)(5) includes the following -- well, let me back up.

That section prohibits the sale or delivery of a firearm or armor-piercing ammunition by a licensed dealer to any person unless the licensee notes in his records, required to be kept pursuant to Section 923 of this chapter, the name, age, and residence of such persons.

Section 923 is precisely what I just referenced, which requires the attorney general to prescribe regulations including 27 CFR 478.124, regarding the Form 4473.

The related regulation for Section 922(b)(5) is cited by the Defendant as 27 CFR 478.125. That regulation provides, quote, when such disposition is made to a non-licensee, the firearms transaction record, Form 4473, obtained by the licensed dealer, shall be retained until the transaction is recorded, separate from the licensee's Form 4473 file, and be readily available for inspection, closed quote. That is subsection (c), 27 CFR Section 478.125(c).

As I mentioned earlier when we were arguing the, charge the Defendant's focus on 922(b)(5) and 27 CFR 478.125, is not incorrect. It is just a different record. That record is the acquisition and disposition record that the dealer completes and that the dealer is required to keep.

The ATF Form 4473 is the official transaction record of every firearms transaction involving an over-the-counter sale that takes place -- interstate sale involving a federally licensed firearms dealer.

One does not negate the other or limit the other or modify the other. They are two separate types of records.

The information required on the Form 4473 is information that is required to be kept in the records of the licensed dealers.

He has lied on that form, as shown by the Government's evidence that he is not a citizen of the United

1.5

States. He indicated that he was a citizen of the United States on the seven occasions charged in the Superseding Indictment.

And the intent to deceive argument is irrelevant here. The intent is not an element that the Government is required to prove. The falsity of the statement is what the Government is required to prove.

With respect to Count 8, there are essentially three elements that the Government is required to demonstrate; that the Defendant knowingly possessed a firearm; that before the Defendant possessed the firearm, he had been committed to a mental institution; and that the firearm possessed traveled in interstate commerce.

The Defendant does not challenge the sufficiency of the Government's evidence as to Elements 1 and 3. His argument focuses on the legal sufficiency of Element 2, that is, whether he had been committed to a mental institution.

He is charged under Section 922(g)(4). That provision of the United States Code does not define "committed to a mental institution." However, federal regulations prescribe that the phrase means: The formal commitment of a person to a mental institution by court, board, commission, or other lawful authority. That is 27 CFR, Section 478.11

The Government introduced records, specifically

Exhibit 9, and witness testimony, specifically Dr. Larsen's testimony, that Mr. Yoo was involuntarily committed to a mental institution pursuant to court orders in 2013 and again in 2015. That evidence satisfies the definition provided in the federal regulations.

As the Court is aware, the United States vs.

Giardina instructs that, although that is question of federal law, the Court can look to state law in making the determination as to whether the prohibited characteristics, specifically whether the Defendant has been committed to a mental institution, satisfies the -- satisfies

Section 922(g)(4).

Mr. Yoo's involuntary commitments took place in the State of New Jersey. In New Jersey the state law requires a temporary court order for an involuntary commitment. And the court proceedings may be initiated by the submission of two clinical commitments, at least one of which is prepared by a psychiatrist.

Upon receipt of these documents, a court makes a determination as to whether there is probable cause to believe the person is in need of involuntary commitment of treatment.

If the court finds probable cause, it shall enter a temporary order authorizing the assignment of the person to an outpatient treatment facility or admission or retention of

1.5

the person in the custody of the facility pending a final hearing.

Again, the Government introduced records,

Exhibit No. 9 and the testimony Dr. Victoria Larsen, that

Mr. Yoo was involuntary committed to a mental institution in

accordance with New Jersey law.

The arguments, again, with respect to the NICS

Improvement Act, that does not change the definition of New

Jersey law, nor does it change the definition provided in the federal regulations under 27 CFR, Section 478.11.

As to the Rehlander decision, I know that the Court has reviewed that decision. Without going into the distinctions between Maine's mental health law and New Jersey's mental health law, I will just say that what bothered the First Circuit in that case is that the commitment under Maine law in that particular situation operated as a permanent deprivation of the Defendant's gun rights. That is not the case here.

Mr. Yoo is not permanently deprived of his gun rights. New Jersey has a relief from disabilities program that has been approved in accordance with the NICS Improvement Act, and he can apply for relief under that program, and upon a sufficient showing, would be able to have his commitment orders expunged from the record, and the legal effect of that would be as if he had never been prohibited in

the first place. 1 So New Jersey already addresses the constitutional 2 concerns that Rehlander expressed and the First Circuit 3 relied upon as basis for the decision here. 4 5 The Government has introduced sufficient proof to support submission of all pending charges for the jury's 6 7 consideration. And the United States would ask that the Defendant's motion be denied. 8 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Coan. 9 All right. Here is what I am going to do --10 MR. YOO: May I --11 THE COURT: Very briefly. 12 MR. YOO: So, first of all --13 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo? 14 15 MR. YOO: Yes, sir. THE COURT: The jury has been waiting about 45 16 17 minutes now. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Well, very briefly. 18 First of all, I did not -- not -- not contest -- I 19 did not contest the fact that the -- the FFL are required 20 to be -- I mean, required to keep ATF Form 4473. 21

Also I need you to look at 18 United States Code, Section 923 Golf 1 Alfa. That is actually the regulatory code for a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, and a licensed dealer, and how they shall maintain records of

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

importation, production, shipment, receipt of sale, and other disposition of firearms. And that is directly related to the code 922 Bravo 5. Also, also we are not talking about New Jersey law We are talking about federal law. This is not -- this is not New Jersey state court. Yes -- yes, I get it --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo --MR. YOO: In the State of New Jersey --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: -- I do not have right --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: -- to bear arms. THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, commitment is a question of state law. It is a function of state law. You are not committed in federal courts. You are committed in state courts. So how can it not be -- I understand your argument with respect to the CFR's, but how can it not be at least informed by state law? MR. YOO: I was never informed of that -- that court -- court order nor by NICS. I inquired --THE COURT: That doesn't answer my question, sir. How is the determination that the jury is going to be asked to make in this case not informed by New Jersey law? MR. YOO: Because 922(g)(4) is a federal law.

THE COURT: Okay.

1.5

MR. YOO: There is a federal standards for what should be considered a formal commitment in terms of NICS entry 922(g)(4).

THE COURT: All right. Let's move on with your next argument.

MR. YOO: All right. That's it.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Yoo, I am required, in responding to a motion under Rule 29, not to assess the credibility of the witnesses or to weigh the evidence or draw any inferences of facts -- of fact from the evidence.

My role, the Court's role, is simply to decide whether the evidence, when viewed in the light most favorable to the Government, is sufficient for any rational trier of fact to determine there has been guilt established beyond a reasonable doubt.

I do think under the circumstances presented in this case and the evidence that has been adduced over the last two days of trial, does support a finding that the evidence, when viewed in the light most favorable to the Government, is sufficient for a rational trier of fact to find guilt based upon a reasonable doubt.

With respect to Counts 1 through 7, there was testimony that the Defendant, who is not a United States citizen, falsely testified to federally licensed firearms dealers located within the Eastern District of Texas on the

1.5

ATF Form 4473 that was used in each of seven different firearms transactions, that his country of citizenship was the United States.

With respect to the 8th count, the Government's evidence has demonstrated that the Defendant was committed to a mental institution by Court orders on two occasions prior to his knowing possession of five firearms, all of which had traveled in interstate commerce.

With respect to the -- your statutory argument that you have made, I am going to -- I am going to reserve a decision on that part of the motion, and we will proceed with the trial and submit the case to the jury.

And then I will decide the motion after the jury returns a verdict, if it does, of guilty. And, of course, we will make that determination at that time.

The written motion for judgment of acquittal pursuant to Rule 29 that you have made in Court has not been filed in the docket on written form. I will look forward to that happening; and once that has occurred, I will more carefully review it, as well as the Government's response, which will be filed once the Defendant's response is filed on the docket -- or once the Defendant's motion is filed on the docket.

Now, I do want to confirm with you, Mr. Yoo, that you do intend to take the stand this morning and testify in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

your behalf. I want to also confirm that you understand and that Mr. Haas has had a conversation with you regarding your constitutional right not to testify. You have a right not to testify just as you have a right to testify. And it is your determination which you want to do. But I do want to confirm that you understand that. MR. YOO: Yes. THE COURT: You do? MR. YOO: Yes. THE COURT: And have you had and opportunity to visit with Mr. Haas, and has he explained to you that you have a right to testify and a right not to testify. MR. YOO: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Haas, would you like to add anything? No, Your Honor. I think that covers it. MR. HAAS: THE COURT: Okay. Anything else before we have the jury brought in? MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Did you know how many "I don't know" answers that the Government's witnesses -- so-called expert witnesses answered? "I don't know." "I don't know." "I don't know." Like that. But -- all right. Just clarifying, so you are reserving your decision, correct?

THE COURT: I am denying it with respect to your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
arguments on the basis of sufficiency of evidence.
motion is denied.
         With respect to your statutory arguments, I am
reserving decision on those.
         MR. YOO: All right. So -- so -- sorry. Let me be
clear. On the evidentiary part, you are denying it. On the
statutory part, you are reserving your decision.
          THE COURT: That is correct.
         MR. YOO: All right. On the evidentiary part, I
object and reserve my right to appeal. Thank you, sir.
         THE COURT: Anything further?
         MR. YOO: No, sir.
         THE COURT: Thank you.
         Mr. Coan, anything further?
         MR. COAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
         THE COURT: All right. Let's have the jury brought
in.
         COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise for the jury.
          (Jury in.)
         THE COURT: Please be seated.
          Good morning. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury,
welcome back.
          I do apologize for our needing to keep you waiting
this morning. I may not have warned you on Tuesday when we
started this trial, and if I failed to do so I apologize,
```

there are times during the course of every trial where I must visit with the lawyers and the parties outside of your presence about legal and other evidentiary matters that need to occur outside of your presence.

We were here and started promptly early this morning. But, unfortunately, that took a little more time than I anticipated. So my apologies for making you wait this morning.

When we concluded the day yesterday, the Government had rested in its case, and we have resolved the legal matters that -- that needed to be resolved.

And at this point the Defendant may call his first witness.

MR. YOO: I would like to call Gregory Harry, FBI.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Coan?

MR. COAN: Your Honor, the concern here is that

Mr. Harry was -- Officer Harry, Detective Harry, TFO Harry

was never identified as a witness by the Defendant, so he has
been present in the courtroom for the duration of the trial.

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, was Mr. Harry disclosed as a witness?

MR. YOO: No, sir. But all of my subpoena for witnesses had been denied, so the only person that -- that -- that is here who can possibly strengthen my argument would be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gregory Harry since my subpoena had been denied because I was not declared in forma pauperis, even though I lost everything upon arrest. THE COURT: Did you serve a subpoena -- or request to serve a subpoena on Mr. Harry specifically? MR. YOO: No, sir. But I would like him to take the witness stand on -- on about three questions. Well, I did file subpoena on the actual witnesses regarding my alleged commitments and all that, and they were denied. Like -- like -- like --MR. COAN: Your Honor, I'm going to object. We are not going into ---- firsthand --MR. YOO: MR. COAN: -- legal matters, pretrial matters. THE COURT: I think we are. So is it the Government's position --MR. COAN: I am just advising the Court of that set of circumstances. The Defendant is welcome to waive that concern. THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Harry has been in the courtroom throughout the course of the trial, Mr. Yoo. That, I guess, implicitly violates the Rule which you invoked that witnesses who were going to testify would not be present in the courtroom during the testimony of other witnesses. Obviously, you didn't disclose him as a witness you

sought to call. So -- but with that understanding, if the 1 Government doesn't object, I will permit the witness to 2 testify. 3 No objection. 4 MR. COAN: THE COURT: All right. Please come forward and be 5 6 sworn. (Witness sworn.) 7 GREGORY HARRY, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN, 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. YOO: 10 So Task Force Officer Gregory Harry, good morning, sir. 11 Good morning. 12 Α. 13 So you have visit my -- my premise prior to my arrest 14 once, correct? 1.5 Α. That's correct. That is -- that is, I believe, 2018-03-23 at around I 16 would say around 1000 or 1100 hours; is that correct? 17 I don't remember the specific time, but March 23rd, 18 2018, does sound correct. 19 20 Yes, sir. Was your intention to search my premise? No. 21 Α. 22 Then could you explain to me the reason why you noted my Q. firearm possession on your report, if it wasn't your 23 intention to search my premise? 24 Well, it was my observation the firearm you are 25 Α.

- referring to is the 12-gauge shotgun that was presented
  yesterday was in your bedroom leaning up against the wall.
- Q. Did you inform me that -- those -- those will be used against?
- A. I am sorry, I am not familiar with -- what are you referring to?
  - Q. Did you inform me prior to -- prior to that interview and filling out that report, that those evidences would be used against me or those supposed evidences?
- A. At the time, you hadn't been charged with any kind of crime, so, no, I didn't inform you that was evidence against you.
  - Q. Were you looking to charge me?
- A. At the time, we were conducting an investigation, an assessment of you. That was the purpose of my visit to you was to interview you. There was no known crime at that time.
- 18 Q. What was your legal basis for investigation?
- A. So one of the main things that we do -- would it be helpful if I kinda explain my role with the FBI?
  - Q. Proceed, sir.

8

9

13

21

A. So, as Mr. Yoo stated and has been addressed, I am a detective with the Tyler Police Department. I am currently assigned to the FBI as a task force officer on the Joint Terrorism Task Force.

One of the things that we do, one of our most important roles these days is the role of kind of a threat assessment, if you will. When allegations are made, people of concern are identified. Those -- I don't know if you could call it a case, but those instances are flowed down to us.

They want us to take an assessment of those threats, those individuals. And that is what we were doing. An assessment had been flowed down to us regarding Mr. Yoo, multiple had. So the purpose of my meeting with him was to get an in-person interview with him, get a feel for him, is there anything here, is there anything we need to be concerned about?

That was the purpose for why I came to speak with you, along with those two UT Tyler Police Department officers.

Q. I understand. But have I ever been convicted of a violent crime or any terroristic threats or anything of that nature?

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, that violates the motion in limine, sir, that you agreed to.

MR. YOO: Sir, the Prosecution has already violated motion in limine by submitting my CHL status. That actually pertains to character reference, nothing of the nature of the charge. So -- so that limine is gone, sir, at this point.

55 MR. MACHICEK: The limine is very much still on file, Your Honor. The questions propounded by the Government did not violate that motion. This question, in fact, does and is inadmissible. MR. YOO: Sir --THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection. Move along, Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. BY MR. YOO: All right. So when -- when you visited my premise, did I hide any firearm possession from you? We didn't really discuss your firearm possession at all, so I'm not sure what you were hiding or intentionally showing. You had asked me about my firearm possession, correct? Q. We did discuss your firearms, yes.

- 16
  - And then I -- I revealed everything to you, correct? Q.
- We discussed what -- well, as I recall, we discussed 18
- what firearms you did have. I think you mentioned two rifles 19
- and a shotgun that we had already saw. 20
- And I did -- I did disclose some -- some things about 21
- pistols that I own too; is that correct? 22
- To the best of my recollection was that we talked about 23
- a firearm in your car. 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

25 MR. YOO: Can we look at your --

1 Permission to approach the witness. THE COURT: Yes. 2 BY MR. YOO: 3 Is this the correct report? 4 5 THE COURT: Can you identify for the record, Mr. Yoo, what you have handed the witness? 6 7 MR. YOO: This is the FBI 302 report filled out by Agent Gregory Harry -- Task Force Officer Gregory Harry 8 himself, back in 2018-03-27. And I would like to mark this 9 as an exhibit. 10 THE COURT: What is the question? What is the 11 question for the witness? 12 BY MR. YOO: 13 Did I -- so you said that I did reveal my firearm 14 15 possession, correct? A. Yes, we did discuss your firearms briefly. That wasn't 16 17 the subject of the interview, yes. So the subject of the interview was threat assessment, 18 19 basically? 20 (Witness nods) That's correct. Α. Does having a -- does having a fourth position political 21 22 view count as a threat? I'm sorry. I missed the something position political 23 24 view.

Can someone -- is someone eligible to be assessed with

- threat -- threat assessment just for having an outside
  political views out of mainstream?
- A. Well, I think it is far more broad than just a political view.
- Q. Have I remained a terroristic threat, to the best of your knowledge?
- 7 MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, I believe that question 8 calls for a legal conclusion.
- 9 THE COURT: Can you rephrase the question, Mr. Yoo?

  10 BY MR. YOO:
- Q. What is the definition of a terroristic threat?

  MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, that calls for a legal
- 14 THE COURT: Can you rephrase the question so that
  15 it doesn't call for a legal conclusion Mr. Yoo?
- 16 MR. YOO: All right.
- 17 | BY MR. YOO:

conclusion.

- Q. Which -- what kind of statements did you hear me making?
- 20 A. Did I personally hear you make?
- Q. Yes. Personally, what is your firsthand knowledge of statements that I -- that you personally hear me making?
- A. The information that I was looking into was all either made on social media, YouTube, SnapChat, things like that.
- 25 You and I had not personally interacted until that day.

- Q. Okay. On your arrest report, you said that you were aware of my mental illness or mental instability; is that
- 4 A. That sounds right. I mean, I was aware of it. I don't recall if that is in my report or not.
- Q. Are you qualified to determine whether someone is mentally unstable?
- 8 A. No.

correct?

- 9 Q. Okay. Did I show any sign of psychotic or neurotic

  10 symptoms during the arrest? Did I show any -- did I have any

  11 outbursts during the arrest, violent outburst?
- 12 A. I am not a medical expert in what the psychotic or neurotic things that you would consider, so I --
- Q. But you claim that I am mentally unstable; is that correct?
- 16 A. I certainly am aware of your history of mental instability.
- Q. Do you know for a fact that those history is true and accurate?
- A. I make the decision based on the information that I have in front of me, the information that I had at the time prior to your arrest, and since that time is that you had been committed on two occasions for mental health issues, for several issues. I am happy to discuss those if you would like. So, yes, I was aware of those issues and those

- concerns. Those are always a concern any time law enforcement makes an arrest with anybody.
- 3 Q. Can it be perjured?

2

4

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Can what be perjured?
- Q. Can those -- is there a possibility that those reports can be perjured?
- A. Mr. Yoo, as Dr. Larsen said yesterday, anything is possible. Is it likely, is it probable, I don't believe so.
- Q. Okay. Is RUPD report and RWJUH -- RUPD reports and RWJUH triage reports consistent and screener reports?
- 12 A. That is very broad question. Can you be more specific?
- Q. So -- all right. So are those two -- so you have viewed both of those files; is that correct? You have viewed Rutgers Police reports and RWJUH reports; is that correct?
  - MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, I am going to object to the Defendant asking the witness to testify from documents that are not in evidence.
  - MR. YOO: I object to his -- his -- his objection. He has submitted all of those documents as -- as exhibit lists, and he is only objecting because he is cornered.
  - MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, my objection is based in law. Those items of evidence have not been offered or admitted into evidence in this proceeding.
  - MR. YOO: I am not displaying those --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What is the question, Mr. Yoo, what exactly is the question? MR. YOO: Sir, are you objecting on behalf of the Prosecution? THE COURT: No, sir, I am trying to rule on the objection that has properly been made to a question I am trying to determine whether the question is appropriate or not. Can you rephrase it, or tell me what it was again? MR. YOO: Yes, sir. BY MR. YOO: Are all those reports consistent with each other, to the best of your knowledge? So, generally yes, sir, I do think they are consistent. Q. Oh, okay. Can you take a -- do you mind if we take a look at one -- one exhibit that I have? THE COURT: You can show it to him. I don't want it published to the jury though. MR. YOO: Well, how do I publish it to the jury? THE COURT: No, I am saying you show it to the witness. Don't show it to the jury on the overhead screen. BY MR. YOO: Is this the correct RUPD report regarding one of my supposed, alleged commitments?

Yes, I am familiar with this report.

Q. Does it say anything about me making a homicidal threat?

MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, I'm going to object. Yet again, these documents haven't been admitted into evidence. Requesting that the witness can review them and asking them if they form the basis of an opinion, is one thing; but having him testify to inadmissible hearsay is quite another.

THE COURT: I sustain the objection, Mr. Yoo.

MR. YOO: I have actually -- I have actually admitted this -- this report within the exhibit list, and this is a pertinent evidence to whether I have been committed or not pursuant to New Jersey law.

THE COURT: That exhibit is not in evidence. And you are welcome to ask the witness whether he reviewed it and whether it formed the basis of, you know, any of the work that he did in this case or not. But the witness has not testified to anything for which that would support his impeachment. I'm not quite sure what you are trying to do here. But that document is not in evidence.

MR. YOO: He did testify that he is aware of my mental instability, but on what legal basis?

THE COURT: Let me give you an opportunity to rephrase your question, and we will see where we go from there.

MR. YOO: Okay. 1 2 BY MR. YOO: So this is the report that led to the Exhibit, I 3 believe, 9 of the Government's screening document; is that 4 5 correct? I am not sure if it links to Exhibit 9, but I am 6 Α. 7 familiar with this report. This report is -- is regarding twenty -- 2013? 8 Q. I do believe that this report references the incident 9 that kind of, I guess, was the catalyst to your 2013 10 commitment. If that is what you are saying, yes. 11 Catalyst or the cause? 12 Q. Whatever started it. 13 Α. 14 Whatever started it. MR. YOO: Your Honor, at this point I would like to 15 submit this into the evidence? 16 THE COURT: Mr. Machicek? 17 MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, that document contains 18 inadmissible hearsay evidence under Federal Rules of Evidence 19 803. 20 THE COURT: Can I see the document? 21 22 MR. YOO: This entire --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo --23 (Bench conference held.) 24 25 MR. YOO: It has been authenticated, sir.

THE COURT: How has it been authenticated? 1 MR. YOO: It is just police report. 2 THE COURT: Is there an affidavit --3 4 MR. YOO: The Government document. I mean, police 5 reports are self-authenticating, according to Federal Rules of Evidence. 6 (Pause.) 7 MR. YOO: That is what leads to my alleged 8 involuntary commitment, and it says "voluntary," and it does 9 not say anything about homicidal threats. So I am trying to 10 challenge the nature of -- nature of this supposed 11 involuntary commitment according to New Jersey law. 12 13 THE COURT: This is not the witness to do that 14 with. MR. YOO: He is the one that actually conducted all 15 of the investigations. 16 17 THE COURT: He has got absolutely nothing to do with what happened in New Jersey, Mr. Yoo. This is 18 completely irrelevant to what happened in New Jersey. If you 19 are trying to attack the validity of your commitment in 20 New Jersey, this is not the witness to do that with. 21 22 MR. YOO: All right. Then I will reserve that -- that report for self-testifying. 23 THE COURT: Well, we will see how that works out. 24 25 (Bench conference concluded.)

BY MR. YOO:

1

2

- Q. So was I respectful and cooperative during the arrest?
- 3 A. Absolutely, yes.
  - Q. Why didn't you display the arrest warrant?
- 5 A. Mr. Yoo, at the time of your arrest, I didn't have your
- 6 arrest warrant in my physical possession. Not only that, it
- 7 | is the standard policy during any type of arrest, officer
- 8 safety, your safety, the safety of the general public is
- 9 paramount. It is our number one concern. It would be
- 10 | impractical for me to have your warrant in my hand. I need
- 11 | to have my hands free and ready for whatever may come my
- 12 way.
- 13 | Q. So how many people were there during my arrest?
- 14 A. How many officers?
- 15 | Q. Yes.
- 16 A. I believe on the original contact was myself and two
- 17 other officers that physically took you into arrest. There
- 18 were several other agents and officers in the area, one for
- 19 safety in the event that you should flee the scene, and that
- 20 were also there for any follow-up investigation that came
- 21 pursuant to that arrest.
- 22 | Q. So was this a planned arrest?
- 23 A. Yes, I would say so.
- 24 Q. What is the legal basis for not having an arrest warrant
- 25 | at a planned arrest pursuant to Federal Rules of Criminal

Procedure Rule 4? 1 MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, I'm going to object that 2 that calls for a legal conclusion. 3 THE COURT: Sustained. 4 You can ask facts about it, Mr. Yoo, but let's 5 don't get into the legality of it. 6 7 MR. YOO: Okay. BY MR. YOO: 8 So, also, you didn't sign the return of the arrest 9 10 warrant? MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, I'm going to object to 11 relevance. 12 THE COURT: Sustained. 13 Move along, Mr. Yoo. 14 15 MR. YOO: This is relevant to this case, sir. THE COURT: It is not. Move along. 16 BY MR. YOO: 17 So I was completely -- so I was completely cooperative 18 and non-violent during the arrest; is that correct? 19 20 I would say so, yes, sir. Α. I was polite; is that correct? 21 22 Oh, absolutely yes. Α. Which vehicle was I in when I was transported to the 23 federal courthouse? 24 My recollection is that you were transported in a Tyler 25

```
Police -- one of our Tahoes, a marked police unit.
1
         Did you have a search warrant at the time of the
 2
    arrest?
 3
              MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
 4
 5
    relevance.
               THE COURT: Sustained.
 6
              Move along.
 7
               MR. YOO: All right. I pass the witness.
 8
               THE COURT: Any cross-examination?
 9
              MR. MACHICEK: Your Honor, the Government has no
10
    questions for this witness. May he be excused?
11
               THE COURT: You may be excused.
12
13
              MR. YOO: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: Call your next witness.
14
              MR. YOO: That's it, sir. I would like to
15
    self-testify.
16
17
               THE COURT: Take the stand.
              MR. YOO: May I testify from there?
18
               THE COURT: No, you take the witness stand.
19
              MR. YOO: Oh, well, I need to present.
20
               THE COURT: You can take it to the witness stand.
21
22
    If you will raise your right hand, and Mrs. Schroeder will
    swear you in.
23
               (Oath administered.)
24
25
              MR. YOO: I am not a Christian, ma'am. But I do
```

solemnly affirm in the name of President Washington. 1 So, Your Honor, since this is narrative testimony, 2 is it okay if I, you know, use the projector? 3 4 THE COURT: No, no. MR. YOO: Where are the --5 (Pause in proceedings.) 6 HEON JONG YOO, DEFENDANT, AFFIRMED, 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 MR. YOO: All right. This is the Defendant's 9 narrative -- narrative testimony as a Pro Se Defendant. 10 So -- so everything started back in 2013-04-05 11 around 0100 hours. That was the -- that was the poisonous 12 tree of this case. Everything else is a fruit. 13 14 What happened then was -- so let me describe the 15 New Jersey law to y'all. MR. COAN: Your Honor, object. 16 17 THE COURT: Mr. Coan -- I mean, Mr. Yoo, this is a factual narrative. You can present facts to the jury; but I 18 think as we've discussed before, this is not an opportunity 19 20 for you to present argument. MR. YOO: I am -- I object to his objection because 21 22 I am trying to present the facts pursuant to what actually happened. 23 THE COURT: The objection of the Government is 24 sustained. You may present facts, but we are not going to 25

talk about what New Jersey law is. 1 MR. YOO: So, in terms of involuntary commitment, 2 what happened back in 2013-04-05 was I was casually just 3 talking about guns, owning guns, getting a firearms license 4 5 with my friends at the dining hall. And then -- and then these two dining hall staff 6 employees named Panagioti Dafnos and Stefanie Oates, they 7 reported me saying that --8 MR. COAN: Objection. Hearsay. 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 You can't testify to what other people said, 11 Mr. Yoo. 12 13 MR. YOO: It is in the proof -- authenticated 14 record, sir. 15 THE COURT: You may not testify to what other people said. 16 17 MR. YOO: Okay. So the police --THE COURT: Unless there is an exception to the 18 hearsay rule; and if you have, you know, got an exception you 19 want to cite, I'm glad to hear it. 20 MR. YOO: Sir, a lot of Prosecution's witnesses 21 were hearsay, and you never sustained any of those. 22 THE COURT: Did you object on the basis of hearsay? 23 I don't recall that you did, Mr. Yoo. 24 MR. YOO: Several times I objected on the basis of 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

20

21

23

25

relevance and several times I objected based on the character reference. THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I try to respond to each objection fairly and impartially regardless of who has raised The Government has raised an objection to your testimony on the basis of hearsay that someone else said something. And that is classic hearsay unless there is an exception that permits it, and I am open to any argument you have got in that regard, but --MR. YOO: Recorded recollection. Public records. Article VIII, Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 803(5)(a) --THE COURT: (5) relates to a recorded recollection 13 of a statement that a witness had made who is unable to recall that testimony or that statement when testifying. So it is basically like refreshing a witness's recollection. That exception does not apply here. 16 MR. YOO: What about (8)? I mean, this is an actual self-authenticating police report, sir. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Coan? 19 MR. COAN: No foundation. THE COURT: Can you lay a foundation for that 22 report? MR. YOO: This is -- I did lay a -- a foundation as I walked in. This is what led to -- what -- what led to 24 my -- my alleged charges that I am facing right now, the

```
involuntary -- alleged involuntary commitment that the
1
     Prosecution --
 2
               THE COURT: Do this, for the record, Mr. Yoo, go
 3
     ahead and lay the foundation for what that report is you seek
 4
 5
     to read from.
               MR. YOO: This report is the Rutgers Police Report,
 6
7
    which is the cause of the --
               THE COURT: What is the date of the report?
 8
               MR. YOO: 2013-04-0 --
 9
10
               THE COURT: Who prepared the report?
               MR. YOO: Officer E. Ruff, Badge No. 3768.
11
               THE COURT: All right.
12
               Mr. Coan, any reason to suspect the trustworthiness
13
     of this document?
14
15
               MR. COAN: No, Your Honor. There are still hearsay
     concerns within the document.
16
17
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I am going to permit you to
     read whatever you want to read from it.
18
               MR. YOO: Yes, sir. So --
19
20
               MR. COAN: Your Honor, just one other objection,
     for record purposes, relevance.
21
22
               THE COURT: Absolutely. That is noted.
               MR. YOO: This is relevant to the -- this leads
23
     up -- this describes the nature of my alleged commitment that
24
25
     they are accusing me of.
```

THE COURT: Okay. 1 MR. YOO: This pertains --2 MR. HAAS: He is letting you read it. Go ahead. 3 MR. YOO: This pertains every bit of New Jersey 4 5 Law. So then -- then Stephanie Oates and Dafnos 6 Okay. reported around 2101 hours that they overheard me talking 7 about guns, owning guns, and my family sells guns. I have 8 not said such things. 9 And, also, 2101 hours is a lot later than when I 10 was actually physically present at the dining hall. So there 11 was no probable cause to -- to involuntarily me transport him 12 13 to the RWJ hospital at that time. MR. COAN: Your Honor, objection. Argumentative. 14 Calls for a legal conclusion. 1.5 THE COURT: That is sustained. 16 17 Only facts, Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: The report specifically states that Yoo 18 19 did not specifically threaten to cause harm to anyone or 20 state that he was going to. The report further states that the RUPD allowed 21 22 me -- me to change into three-piece suit before getting transferred -- transported to the Robert Wood Johnson 23 Hospital. And then the -- the report states: Yoo expressed 24 a strong desire to purchase guns legally in a manner which 25

seemed to obsess over the issue over obtaining a gun. 1 2 also states --MR. COAN: Your Honor, I am unclear here. I know 3 it is a narrative format, but we are just now reading from 4 5 documents. THE COURT: Is there something about that document 6 that is important to you, Mr. Yoo? 7 MR. YOO: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Let's focus on that and read that. 9 MR. YOO: I believe Prosecution is abusing their 10 discretion on objections, Your Honor, and to purposely 11 delaying prompt proceeding of trial. 12 THE COURT: Your objection is overruled. Please 13 14 move along. MR. YOO: It is stated that Yoo voluntarily --15 voluntarily was transported to the Robert Wood Johnson 16 17 Hospital via --MR. COAN: We are still reading from the report. 18 MR. YOO: -- ambulance. 19 20 MR. COAN: Your Honor, I renew my objection. THE COURT: Move along. 21 So this is not -- pursuant to RUPD 22 MR. YOO: reports, this is not -- not involuntary transport to the --23 to the hospital. And -- and in the -- the Robert Wood 24 Johnson UH Hospital reports it -- it -- the Robert Wood 25

```
Johnson reports completely contradict these RUPD reports.
1
              MR. COAN: Your Honor. Hearsay, not in evidence.
 2
              MR. YOO: Permission to submit them as evidences
 3
    pertaining to this -- this alleged commitment record.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Are those reports not in evidence?
    They are not; is that correct?
 6
 7
              MR. COAN: That's correct.
               THE COURT: All right. Do you have copies of
 8
    those, Mr. Yoo?
 9
              MR. YOO: Yes, sir. They are among the
10
    Government's exhibits.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Coan?
12
                         They haven't been introduced.
13
              MR. COAN:
14
               MR. YOO:
                         That's why --
              MR. COAN: They are in the notebook, Your Honor.
15
              MR. YOO: -- permission to enter into the
16
17
    evidence.
               THE COURT: Any objection to entering them?
18
              MR. COAN: I would ask for a foundation.
19
20
    Relevance.
21
               THE COURT: Can you lay a foundation for them?
22
              MR. YOO: Credibility of the medical, quote,
    unquote, professionals as Dr. Larsen -- Dr. Larsen testified
23
    that they are highly unlikely to lie.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Here is what I am going to
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

permit you to do, Mr. Yoo, you are testifying right now as a fact witness. I am going to permit you to finish your testimony. You can talk to the jury about the facts. And then after that, I will give you an opportunity to admit whatever evidence you believe is appropriate, as long as it complies with the Federal Rules of Evidence. So let's confine our discussion right now to the facts. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Among submitted evidences, which are Exhibit 9 of the -- Exhibit 9 of the Prosecution's evidences from Middlesex County Court, Kenneth Kaufman, who actually screened me, wrote down on his report that Yoo threatened to kill his RA. That statement completely contradicts what this -- this report -- Kenneth Kaufman has specifically stated --MR. COAN: Now, we are making credibility determinations. Objection. I am just -- I am just presenting facts, MR. YOO: sir. I am not --MR. COAN: Argumentative. MR. YOO: -- contesting credibility. Prosecution is abusing its discretion of raising objections. THE COURT: Just move along, Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: Kenneth Kaufman has stated that RUPD

Rutgers Police transported me to the Robert Wood Johnson

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Hospital because I have threatened to kill my RA with a gun. It is completely incontradictory with -- with this report. Also, I have never --MR. COAN: Again, legal argument, Your Honor. Object. That's a factual argument, Your Honor. MR. YOO: THE COURT: Move along, Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: At a mental health commitment hearing, the burden of proof lies on the state --THE COURT: Mr. Yoo. Mr. Yoo, I am not going to permit you to make a legal argument. I have told you that now half a dozen times. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I am going to let you make your legal argument when the Government presents their legal argument, closing statement at the end of all of the evidence. Okay? Right now I am confining you to your testimony about the facts. MR. YOO: Facts. THE COURT: Facts. MR. YOO: The RUPD never noted that I have ever, ever threatened anyone nor -- nor they -- they -- they stated that I -- I was a threat to myself or others. That is only defined in those two -- two confinements at the hospital. And I don't know the origin of those -- those

1.5

alleged homicidal threats that I made, which is stated in the screening documents.

I also have -- so on -- so on 2015 -- 2015-09-21, the RUPD responded to a call of a Rutgers student that I was making a -- a terroristic threat on the phone at the -- at the location called College Avenue Gym.

I had told RUPD what -- honestly and truthfully what I have said. I have explained that I yelled, "death to Middle East" -- I had a heated discussion with my friend on the phone saying, "death to Middle East."

And then I have explained to the -- the RUPD I was not targeting a person, I was not targeting an individual, but I hate the culture of Middle East, and I hate the constitutional incompatibility of Middle Eastern culture and the laws of Middle Eastern nations --

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, what is this relevant to? Why do you want the jury to hear this?

MR. YOO: Dr. Larsen testified yesterday that through personal observation of RUPD -- sorry. Through personal observation of law enforcement, there has to be -- the law enforcement has to believe that a person is a threat to himself or others to be involuntarily transported to the hospital. I am -- the grounds for what -- what -- what -- what the facts were and what their interpretation was.

MR. COAN: Your Honor, the only objection I have is

the mischaracterization of the testimony with respect to stating that Dr. Larsen testified that involuntary transport was required. That is not her testimony.

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I am just cautioning you about getting into your opinions that aren't particularly relevant to this proceeding. I don't -- I don't see that there is much benefit to you in doing that.

MR. YOO: Sir, I wasn't stating -- stating my opinions. That is what I -- that is the facts that I told Rutgers Police on that report.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YOO: Yes.

1.5

So then -- then -- and -- a -- an -- a -- an emergency service unit lieutenant from Rutgers Police evaluated me, and then he determined that I was in further need of evaluation, transported me to the RWJUH. And on the -- on the RWJUH report, it is stated that I was -- that I was also -- I was also -- sorry, I had been involuntarily committed back in 2011 for making a homicidal threat. And I was making a terroristic threat -- threat against -- against Middle East and the Middle Eastern people.

However, back in 2011, I was attending an international school in South Korea near Army base.

And -- and I was not present at New Jersey. The only place in the United States that I visited back in -- back in 2011

was Texas; Dallas, Texas.

Proceeding on.

On twenty -- so the -- the FBI -- on -- sorry. On those two involuntary commitments, supposed accounts and when those Middlesex County Adjuster forwarded those records to the FBI NICS, NICS database, I was not informed of their entry proceeding at all. I was not informed of that entry proceeding, nor that -- that -- that entry until this case started through the criminal complaint affidavit of Agent James Reed.

On 2016-01-19 around 1400 hours, I was there -sorry, not 1400. 1600 hours I was at Fort Worth Gun -- to
the best of my knowledge, 1600 hours. I was at the Fort
Worth Gun Shop attempting to purchase a shotgun.

I -- I entered incorrect name, address, and the -- and the date of birth. And I ran -- ran that shotgun through the NICS background check. It came back denied. And the gun -- the firearms licensee informed me how to appeal that decision.

I promptly appealed it. Stated -- stated -- may I review the documents, Your Honor? I -- I -- I do not want to commit perjury. That is why.

THE COURT: Sure.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MR. YOO: I apologize to the jurors for unnecessary

delay.

32. All right. This had been -- this had been entered into evidence by the Prosecution.

THE COURT: What is the exhibit number? Do you know?

MR. YOO: 32.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. YOO: I have never been convicted of any criminal offense. I am a green card holder. Also, I had — I only had been recently charged with a misdemeanor, disorderly conduct. However, I dropped the charge because that was a false accusation. Today I tried to purchase a firearm but got denied. May I note the reason why I got denied, so I can take care of it and appeal it?

And then they subsequently -- subsequently responded on 2016-01-26 stating all of the different factors, prohibiting factors why a -- why a person can be denied of a firearm -- firearm transaction. They, however, did not specify any reason why my entry was -- was denied specifically, nor -- nor whether any of these factors specifically applied to me. Nor -- nor have they ever informed me of -- of this 922(g)(4) entry any time during this inquiry/appeal.

On -- on -- on 2016-01-0 -- sorry. On 2016-01-26, I swore into the United States Army at Dallas MEPCOM. And

around 2016-04-26, about four months before I -- I was -- sorry. A little less than four months before I was scheduled to ship out to boot camp, I was disqualified.

And -- and only through this case I have realized that I was disqualified because of this NICS entry. I have even -- I have even contacted Congressman Sam Johnson to make an inquiry/appeal on my firearm denial and military disqualification.

MEPCOM just told him, oh, it was because of his --

MR. COAN: Objection. Hearsay.

MR. YOO: -- mental reasons.

THE COURT: I will sustain that.

MR. YOO: I have visited several gun stores, and I have visited several gun stores at Tyler, Texas, and I have purchased -- I have purchased firearms. And I have overridden -- I have overridden NICS background checks by exhibiting my Texas Concealed Handgun License.

I have never been convicted of any crime. I have never yet -- I have never been convicted of any crime. I have never been a fugitive from justice.

MR. COAN: This violates the in limine.

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, this violates the motion in limine, which you agreed to. You have informed the jury on a number of occasions throughout this trial that you have never been convicted of a crime. I think they understand that now.

Let's -- let's move along. 1 MR. YOO: Sir, the Prosecution has waivered their 2 limine first because they submit a character reference, and 3 they also have submitted irrelevant references that would 4 5 be -- that would be considered character references. THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I think you brought up the 6 7 question of your lack of criminal history in your opening statement for the record. 8 MR. YOO: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: Let's just move along. 10 MR. YOO: I am just going along the list of what 11 the FBI NICS had. Thank you, sir. 12 I am not an unlawful user of or addicted to any 13 control substance --14 15 MR. COAN: That is argument. It calls for legal conclusion. 16 17 MR. YOO: I am just reading off of --THE COURT: Overruled. 18 19 Go, ahead Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: I was not informed of that entry that I 20 had -- that I have entered as adjudicated as mentally 21 22 defective or have been committed to a mental institution. am not an alien and are illegally or unlawfully in the United 23 States. 24 I have not been discharged from United States 25

military under dishonorable conditions. I have never renounced U.S. citizenship. I have never been a subject of court order that -- that -- that restrains the person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner or engaging in other conduct that would place the partner or child in a reasonable fear of bodily injury.

I have never been convicted of a -- well, yeah -- okay.

So back in 2016-01-26, looking at these, this list, I was -- I was completely unaware that any of these -- these entries had been made to my record.

So -- and there had been a -- several law -- law enforcement visits to my premise, including local, state, and federal.

However, they have never confiscated and kept my firearms. They were well aware of my firearm possessions.

However, they have never confiscated it. They have never raised any issues in terms of my firearm ownership throughout the course of almost three years of my firearm ownership.

And regarding adjudicated mentally defective committed to a mental institution entry, I was discharged administratively from the hospital well before the hearing date. All of my supposed commitments had occurred throughout ex parte communication.

I have never even met the counsel that -- of those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Somerset Superior Court of -- of new Jersey had -- has appointed me to represent me throughout those hearing. I have never been served a proper due process. Ι have never examined any evidences -- I have never examined --MR. COAN: That is legal argument. THE COURT: I'm sorry? MR. COAN: Legal argument. Sir, I would just submitting facts. THE COURT: Okay. Move along. MR. YOO: Yes. I have never examined any of the -- any of the evidences nor documents. They have never -- after they have -- after the discharge, they haven't even gave me any paperwork they have processed to the court whatsoever, so I was completely uninformed of this -- these supposed entries. On 2018-04-06, I was arrested, and then I was placed under U.S. Marshal custody, and then I was transported to Smith County Jail and then -- then transported to Gregg County Jail around 21 days later. And I have been incarcerated there ever since. Then I started examining bunch of evidences and discoveries, both the Prosecution and my previous attorneys have made. From there I discovered through -- firstly through

Agent Reed's criminal complaint affidavit of those two NICS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

entries, adjudicated mentally defective/committed to a mental institution. I was confused and surprised to, like, find out that I had been labeled adjudicated mentally defective/committed to a mental institution because around -the only plausible medical record -- I'm sorry, mental health record, only voluntary mental health record that I have of any form of assessment or evaluation that I have gone through that I chose to do, consented to do was -- happened back in November -- October and November of 2015. And on those -- those reports I was deemed high functioning --MR. COAN: Objection. Hearsay. MR. YOO: -- and completely mentally sane. MR. COAN: Relevance. MR. YOO: Actually, that has been submitted --THE COURT: Hold on just a moment, Mr. Yoo. I'm going to overrule the objection. Move along, Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. So that report has specifically stated that I have high I.Q. I do not have any emotional disturbance nor neurological disorder. So that was the only report that I could have gone by until I found this discovery.

And, yeah. That concludes my testimony, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Yoo. 1 2 step down. I will permit the Government to cross-examine 3 Mr. Yoo when we return from our break. 4 5 Ladies and Gentlemen, don't forget not to discuss the case among yourselves until all of the evidence has been 6 7 presented, and I have instructed you on the law. We will be in recess about 15 minutes. 8 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise for the jury. 9 10 (Jury out.) (Recess was taken at this time.) 11 (Jury out.) 12 13 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, on the stand. Thank you very much. 14 I think for the purposes of any objections to 15 questions on cross-examination, Mr. Yoo, what I will ask you 16 17 to do is just address those to me. So if Mr. Coan asks you something on 18 19 cross-examination that you, in your role as Pro Se Counsel, 20 think is an inappropriate question, I will just ask you to turn and direct your objection to me, and I will rule on it. 21 22 MR. YOO: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Okay let's have the jury brought in. 23 24 (Jury in.) THE COURT: Please be seated. 25

1 Mr. Coan, you may cross-examine the witness. Thank you, Your Honor. 2 MR. COAN: CROSS-EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. COAN 4 5 Good morning, Mr. Yoo. Good morning, sir. 6 Α. 7 You are not a United States citizen, correct? No, I am not. 8 Α. You have falsely represented your citizenship in 9 connection with firearms purchases; is that correct? 10 Yes. 11 Α. You have made these statements to federally licensed 12 firearms dealers? 13 14 Yes, I did. Α. And those federally licensed firearm dealers were 15 Q. located in the Eastern District of Texas; is that correct? 16 17 Yes, I did. Α. And you made those false statements by lying on ATF Form 18 4473s; is that correct? 19 20 Yes, sir. Α. 21 On September 13th of 2016, you went to Superior 22 Firearms; is that correct? 23 Α. Yes. You completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right? 24

25

Α.

Yes.

- Q. On the form you falsely stated that you are a United
- 2 | States citizen; is that correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- $4 \parallel Q$ . You signed the form attesting that all information was
- 5 | true and correct; is that right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. On November 3rd of 2016, you went to First Cash Pawn in
- 8 | Tyler, Texas; is that right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. You completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. On the form you falsely stated that you are a United
- 13 | States citizen; is that right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. You signed the form attesting that all information was
- 16 | true and correct; is that right?
- 17 A. I never testified. That wasn't testifying. But I did
- 18 | sign, yes.
- 19 Q. On November 17th of 2016, you went to First Cash Pawn;
- 20 | is that right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And you completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. On the form you falsely stated that you are a United
- 25 | States citizen; is that right?

A. Yes.

- $2 \parallel Q$ . On November 17th of 2016, you went back to First Cash
- 3 Pawn; is that right?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- $5 \parallel Q$ . And you completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- $7 \parallel Q$ . And on the form you falsely stated that you are a United
- 8 | States citizen; is that right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. On November 18th of 2016, you went to Academy Sports in
- 11 Tyler, Texas; is that right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And you completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right?
- 14 A. Not fully. I mean, what happened was I -- I exhibited
- 15 | an identification. But I did -- did fill out that -- that
- 16 part, United States citizen.
- 17 Q. Okay. And on the form you falsely stated you are a
- 18 United States citizen; is that right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. On November 6th of 2017, you went to Cash America Pawn
- 21 | in Tyler, Texas; is that right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And you completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right?
- 24 A. Well, again, I exhibited my identification and it was
- 25  $\parallel$  mostly completed by the person at the counter. But, yes, I

- 1 | did -- did say I am a United States citizen because
- 2 that -- that -- that fact -- fact is not shown --
- 3 | Q. And you signed the form attesting that all of the
- 4 | information was true and correct?
- 5 A. Testifying, no.
- 6  $\parallel$  Q. Signed the form stating --
- 7 A. Signing, yes.
- 8 Q. Okay. And the certification is that all of the
- 9  $\parallel$  information contained in the ATF Form 4473 that you completed
- 10 | is true and correct; is that right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. On November 7th of 2017, you went back to Cash America
- 13 Pawn; is that right?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And you completed an ATF Form 4473; is that right?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And on the form you falsely --
- 18 A. Wait. Again, I exhibited an ID, but I did fill out,
- 19 yes, I am a United States citizen.
- 20 Q. And you signed the form confirming, certifying that the
- 21 answers you provided on the ATF Form 4473 were true and
- 22 | correct?
- 23 A. I signed, yes.
- 24 Q. You have been committed to a mental institution; is that
- 25 || right?

A. Negative.

define.

1

6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. You have been committed to a mental institution in the State of New Jersey on two occasions; is that correct?
- A. No. Define "commitment"? Is it -- are you saying commitment pursuant to federal standards or what? Further
- Q. In April of 2013, were you transported to a university hospital in New Jersey by Rutgers University police?
- 9 A. Voluntarily or involuntary?
- Q. Were you transported by university police to a hospital in New Jersey in or about April of 2013?
- 12 A. Please define the condition of that -- that 13 transportation condition and nature.
- Q. Were you transported by university police to the
  emergency room of the hospital in New Jersey in April of
  2013?

MR. YOO: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Yoo, Mr. Yoo, you either can answer the question "yes" or "no"; or you can explain to Mr. Coan why you cannot answer the question "yes" or "no."

MR. YOO: Okay.

- THE COURT: Then at that point he can rephrase his question if he wants to.
- A. I cannot answer your question because you have not identified whether voluntarily or involuntarily.

BY MR. COAN:

- Q. Were you examined by certified mental health officials
- 3 and medical doctors in April of 2013 at a hospital in New
- 4 Jersey?

- 5 A. April 2013? Yes.
- 6 Q. How did you get there?
- 7 A. RUPD transferred me there voluntarily.
- 8 Q. Those certified mental health officials and medical
- 9 doctors conducted examinations and evaluations of you during
- 10 your time in the hospital; is that right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And based on those examinations, they concluded that you
- 13 suffer from a mental illness; is that right?
- 14 A. Based on lies, yes.
- 15  $\parallel$  Q. And they also concluded that you presented a danger to
- 16 | others; is that right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. They also concluded that you were unwilling to be
- 19 admitted voluntarily for care; is that right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. And then subsequent to that, you were involuntarily
- 22 committed to treatment at an inpatient facility, specifically
- 23 | the Carrier Clinic; is that right?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. In September of 2015, you were transported by Rutgers

University Police to the emergency room; is that right?

- A. I cannot answer that question without you defining
- 3 what -- identifying the conditions. Was it voluntary or
- 4 | involuntary?

1

- $5 \parallel Q$ . On or about September 20th of 2015, were you evaluated
- 6 and examined by certified mental health officials and
- 7 | medical -- and psychiatrists at Rutgers University Behavioral
- 8 | Health Care?
- 9 MR. YOO: Objection, Your Honor. Please compel the
- 10 Prosecution to rephrase the question.
- 11 THE COURT: I can ask him to rephrase that
- 12 | question. You explained to him that you could not answer the
- 13 previous question without him rephrasing it, and he decided
- 14 | to ask a different question. So I am going to give him a
- 15 | chance to rephrase his different question, and see if you can
- 16 answer that.
- MR. YOO: Oh, in terms of different question, can
- 19 BY MR. COAN:
- 20 Q. On or about September 20th of 2015, were you evaluated
- 21 and examined by certified mental health officials and
- 22 psychiatrists at Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care?
- 23 A. Evaluated, no; examined, yes.
- 24 | Q. How did you get there?
- 25 A. Rutgers Police transported me there voluntarily.

- Q. Based upon these evaluations and examinations --
- A. On false pretenses.
- Q. Did those mental health officials and medical doctors conclude that you suffer from a mental illness?
- A. Based on lies of the hospital staff completely disregarding my testimony -- I mean, not testimony but
- statements, and completely, completely disregarding RUPD reports, yes. Based on complete hearsay, yes. No factual

9 evidentiary basis.

MR. COAN: Your Honor, I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions of the answer there.

12 BY MR. COAN:

1

2

10

11

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 13 Q. Did those mental health official and medical doctors --
  - MR. YOO: Objection, Your Honor. It was actually a factual determination to what the validity of the -- of the facts answering Prosecution's question.

THE COURT: We will handle this the way we did before. We will handle this the way we did before, Mr. Yoo. I am going to give Mr. Coan an opportunity to ask the question again. If you can answer it with a "yes" or "no" answer, please do that. If you cannot, explain to him that you cannot.

MR. YOO: Sir --

THE COURT: No. First, let him rephrase the question or ask the question again, and then you decide

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

19

21

25

question if he wants to.

whether you can answer it "yes" or "no." MR. YOO: I was objecting to motion to strike. THE COURT: I understand that. We will move on. Let's see if we can fix it. BY MR. COAN: During this September 2015 visit to the emergency room at Rutgers University Behavioral Health Care, were you evaluated by certified mental health officials and medical doctors? No, I was never evaluated. I was examined. And based upon those examinations, did those officials determine that you suffer from a mental illness? 12 13 Again, based on lies and the hearsay of the hospital 14 staff, yes. MR. COAN: Again, Your Honor, I just asked for a "yes" or "no." THE COURT: Can you not answer the question with a "yes" or "no," Mr. Yoo. 18 MR. YOO: Sir, you never compelled other witnesses to answer questions just "yes" or "no." 20 THE COURT: I am not compelling you. I am 22 absolutely not compelling you. What I am telling you is if you can, please do so. And if you cannot, please explain 23 that to Mr. Coan and give him a chance to rephrase his 24

Mr. Coan, that -- that -- that might mislead the jury to 1 the validity of those examinations. 2 MR. COAN: Is that testimony or argument? It is 3 just a "yes" or "no" question. 4 5 THE COURT: Just rephrase the question. MR. YOO: Rephrase it. 6 BY MR. COAN: 7 Did they conclude that you suffer from a mental 8 illness? 9 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, if you can answer "yes" or 10 "no," please do so. If you cannot, explain that to Mr. Coan, 11 and he can rephrase his question. 12 13 Again, please re -- please rephrase it. Please add something like "truthfully." 14 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, if you cannot answer "yes" or 15 "no," just tell him that you can't answer "yes" or "no." 16 17 A. I can't answer "yes" or "no" without further defining factors. 18 BY MR. COAN: 19 Q. As part of that September 2015 visit to the hospital did 20 certified mental health officials and medical doctors 21 conclude that you were a danger to others? 22 Again, I cannot answer "yes" or "no" without further 23 defining factors. 24

Q. Based upon those findings, did they also determine that

- 1 | you were unwilling to be admitted voluntarily for care?
- 2  $\parallel$  A. Again, I cannot -- actually, yes, that is yes.
- 3 | Q. And then based upon those findings that you suffered
- 4 | from a mental illness, that you were a danger to others, and
- 5 unwilling to be admitted voluntarily for care, did those
- 6 officials recommend that you be involuntarily committed to a
- 7 | mental institution?
- 8 A. Recommend? Did you say "recommend"?
- 9 Q. That was the question, yes.
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And then subsequently a court ordered for you to be
- 12 | involuntarily admitted to Carrier Clinic; is that right?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 | Q. Have you sought relief from your prohibited person
- 15 | status through New Jersey's relief from disabilities
- 16 program?
- 17 A. I cannot answer that question because you asked two
- 18 different questions in one question. Prohibiting factor is
- 19 | federal. Did I sought -- have I sought to expunge those
- 20 | hospital confinement records, yes, I actually have.
- 21  $\square$  Q. And what is the status of that?
- 22 A. I don't know. I haven't talked to my family
- 23 attorney -- attorney Matthew Jeon in New Jersey in a long
- 24 time.
- 25 | Q. You told us on direct that you knew that you were

- prohibited by federal law from possessing the firearms; is that right?
- 3 A. No. Wait. Did I know it? What?
- 4 | Q. You received a letter in or about January of 2016 from
- 5 | the FBI telling you that you were a prohibited person under
- 6 | federal law from possessing a firearm; is that right?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. I think you testified to that fact on direct.
- 9 A. I testified to the -- to receiving the letter. I did
- 10 | not testify on them informing me. Those two are completely
- 11 different things.
- 12 | Q. You mentioned a couple of different times about some
- 13 connection to the United States Military. You have attempted
- 14 | to enlist in the U.S. Army on multiple occasions; is that
- 15 | right?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And you have been denied every time; is that right?
- 18 A. Because of that fraudulent NICS entry, yes, it has
- 19 | ruined my life for last six years.
- 20 | Q. Actually, you were denied entry in the United States
- 21 Army because you were evaluated in the State of New Jersey in
- 22 | September of 2015 and determined by licensed health
- 23 professionals that you were not psychologically suited for
- 24 | the United States Army. Is that right?
- 25 A. That was the ultimate reason why I was denied for the

United States Army. That was -- that was only submitted to my -- one of my recruiters name of Sgt. Sean Lawhead.

I was denied even prior to that, and the actual reason is Army uses the NICS background check system, and I had been fraudulently entered as not -- committed to a mental institution, adjudicated mentally defective.

Army and all military recruiting statements actually use -- use the FBI NICS background check system.

They took my fingerprint everything. So, no, that is not -- actually that is not the ultimate reason why I was disqualified.

- Q. You recall the mental health evaluation that took place at the Institute for Forensic Psychology in September of 2015; is that right?
- A. I do recall that. However, that does not conclude me as adjudicated mentally defective nor committed to a mental institution. That happened prior to that, and the FBI NICS entry is the reason why I was denied of military entrance from the start.
- I -- I had been trying to enlist since January of 2015. That happened all the way in September. Even prior to that recruiter, I was disqualified based on the NICS entry.
- Q. But the conclusion of this evaluation in September 2015, is that you were not psychologically suited to enlist in the United States Army; is that right?

- A. Mr. Gallegos, who was completely biased towards me, yeah and -- yeah.
- Q. In fact, you told the FBI in August of 2016 that you had been permanently disqualified from entering the Army and would never be allowed to join; is that right?
- A. That is what the MEPCOM informed me, because of that -that fraudulent entry. But I still -- I still tried to join
  afterwards.
- 9 Q. You testified on direct that you obtained a Texas

  10 Concealed Carry Permit for the purpose of overriding the NICS

  11 background check?
- 12 A. For the purpose of it, no. The purpose for -- for -- 13 for obtaining CHL was to carry a gun. Period.
- Q. When you applied for -- well, let me ask you this: You applied for this state carry permit in early February of 2016; is that right?
- 17 A. Yes, I have.

- Q. This was shortly after you received the letter from the FBI informing you that you were prohibited under federal law from possessing a firearm; is that right?
- A. Again, that is false. No one informed me that I -- that
  I was prohibited under federal law from possessing a -- a
  firearm until this case commenced.
  - Also, the -- I believe that -- that the

    Constitution is the supreme authority of this country. So

```
right to bear arms, no, I am not prohibited. No one is prohibited.
```

- Q. So when you applied for your state carry permit here in Texas, you lied about having received psychiatric treatment; is that right?
- A. Did I lie? No. Because that wasn't a lie. Do you know why? Because I have never consented to any form of psychiatric treatment, nor have I been ordered by any legal -- legal authority to be put under constant psychiatric treatment. So, no, that was not a lie.
- Q. In September of 2016, your concealed carry permit was revoked; is that right?
  - A. They attempted to -- to revoke it, but it was not revoked until March 17th of 2017.
    - Q. And it was revoked because the Medical Advisory Board of the Texas Department of State Health Services had determined that you were not capable of exercising sound judgment with respect to the proper use and storage of a handgun; is that right?
    - A. Again, I appealed. I filed appeal, and then the -- the person who examined me for -- for November 2015 -- the allegation actually -- actually recommended me to -- recommended that -- the Medical Board to retain my CHL.

But there was three supposed doctors from -- supposed physicians from the Advisory Board. They have never

met me before. However, they ruled. Yeah.

background check to begin with.

- Q. After you filed your appeal of the September 2016 revocation, that revocation was affirmed in March of 2017; is that right?
- A. Yes.

1.5

- Q. And you have used your revoked concealed carry permit on at least two occasions to purchase firearms; is that right?
  - A. Yes, I have. I used my revoked concealed carry permit to purchase -- no, no. One was purchased, one was exchanged.

    And that was a shotgun for home defense. Also, also, I should never have been prohibited, denied of any form of
  - Q. One of the times that you used a revoked Texas Concealed Carry Permit to acquire a firearm was on November 6th of 2017 at Cash America Pawn; is that right?
- 16 A. Yes.
  - Q. And the other time that you used a revoked Texas Conceal Carry Permit to acquire a firearm was on November 7th of 2017, also at Cash America Pawn; is that right?
  - A. Yes. And also it was fraudulently revoked because they had -- they violated my due process. And while -- while they had pending aggravated assault charge, they were supposed to delay -- postpone the hearing after that charge has been disposed of. That charge was dismissed in July. But they purposely did not postpone the hearing. The felony

```
Indictment is grounds for suspension, not revocation of
1
     CHL.
 2
               MR. COAN: Your Honor, I will pass the witness.
 3
               THE COURT: All right.
 4
 5
               Mr. Yoo, do you have anything that you wish to
     testify to in redirect examination?
 6
 7
               MR. YOO: Yes, sir.
                           REDIRECT EXAMINATION
 8
                        So briefly describing that aggravated
               MR. YOO:
 9
     assault incident, basically, what happened was -- I -- I was
10
     with this -- this individual named -- named Matt Lack and two
11
     others and then he --
12
               MR. COAN: Your Honor --
13
               MR. YOO: -- displayed --
14
               MR. COAN: -- to protect the record I am going to
15
     object.
16
               THE COURT: And the basis?
17
               MR. COAN:
                         In limine.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. I think the door on this to some
19
20
     degree got opened.
21
               MR. COAN: I agree, but I am going to object.
22
               THE COURT: Very well. Your objection is noted.
               Mr. Yoo, please proceed.
23
               MR. YOO: So I was the -- the important factor here
24
     is that Matt Lack took my pistol without -- without my
25
```

permission, put it in his jacket, and when -- when he was having that confrontation with supposed victims, in the middle of it, he took it out. I don't know if he pointed it at them. To the best of my knowledge, he did not point at them.

I approached him, took the pistol away from him, and put that pistol in my pocket, and I forced him to disengage and return to the truck.

Yes, I did -- I did yell out some racial slurs to the victim. Yes, I did yell out some insults, but that was about it in terms of my -- my engagement with him. I forced Matt Lack to disengage. I took the pistol away from Matt Lack.

Lucas Machicek was the prosecutor for that case -- MR. COAN: Your Honor, object --

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, I don't particularly see how that is relevant.

MR. YOO: Okay.

My CHL revocation contest hearing should have been postponed until that -- that Indictment was disposed of.

That Indictment was dismissed on January -- on July 29th of 2017, because I did not commit an aggravated assault. In fact, I committed no crime that day.

So after that -- but -- sorry. But this CHL revocation hearing happened way prior to that. It was a

```
severe violation of my due process because it happened March
1
     17th, 2017, in violation to the Texas Government code.
 2
               And that is what -- that is what Mr. Coan is
 3
 4
     referring to. And, yes, I did use my -- use my CHL to
     override denial because -- because I was not informed of any
 5
     of the federal firearm prohibiting factors that had applied
 6
     to me, at all.
 7
               I thought it was just a -- either a technical error
 8
     when I filed the inquiry/appeal because they had never
 9
     informed me and -- yeah.
10
               Also -- also, after being -- after being
11
     transported to the Smith County Jail and the Gregg County
12
     Jail, upon reading my -- my discovery, I found it out.
13
14
               I do not even have access to law library nor my
1.5
     docket there. I am completely --
               MR. COAN: Your Honor, object.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo --
17
               MR. YOO: -- without --
18
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo --
19
20
               MR. YOO: --- able to figure it out.
               THE COURT: Let's just focus on the facts.
21
               MR. YOO: Yes, sir. I am saying the fact that even
22
     though I was deprived of law library and docket access, I was
23
     still able to figure out the federal laws and the federal,
24
     you know, disqualification factors and all that.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then I realized that that adjudicated mentally defective and committed to a mental institution factor is 922(g)(4), after -- well after commencement of this case. And what else did Mr. Coan address? Again, I did state I was a United States citizen, but I gave proper name. I never gave fictitious name, fictitious date of birth, nor fictitious address. Thank you. That's all. THE COURT: You may step down. Mr. Coan, I didn't give you an opportunity to Do you want to recross the witness on anything? recross. MR. COAN: No additional questions. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, you may step down. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Sorry if I was like facing this way (indicating). I kind of had to face you and the jury at the same time. THE COURT: You did fine. MR. YOO: Thank you. THE COURT: You may step down. The Defendant may call its next witness. Okay. MR. YOO: That's about it, Your Honor. THE COURT: No additional witnesses? MR. YOO: No additional witnesses. THE COURT: Okay. Any additional evidence you wish to submit?

MR. YOO: No, Your Honor, that is pretty much it. 1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yoo. 2 Mr. Coan, does the Government wish to call any 3 rebuttal witnesses? 4 5 MR. COAN: No. THE COURT: Does the Government rest on its entire 6 7 case? MR. COAN: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, Does the Defendant rest on its 9 entire case. 10 MR. YOO: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Subject to closing arguments. The 12 Defendant does rest on its entire case; is that correct? 13 MR. YOO: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen of the 15 Jury, the attorneys and Mr. Yoo and I have some final things 16 17 we have to discuss before we begin our presentation of the Court's instructions to you and the closing arguments. 18 Your lunch should be ready. We can go ahead and 19 20 have lunch now. Is that your preference? Seems to be the 21 preference. 22 All right. So we will go ahead and break for lunch 23 Hopefully, somewhere in about an hour we will be ready to begin closing instructions and argument. 24 So we will be in recess. 25

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise for the jury. 1 2 (Jury out.) MR. YOO: Your Honor? 3 4 THE COURT: Hold on just a moment. 5 Yes, Mr. Yoo. MR. YOO: Permission to call one -- one witness. 6 THE COURT: No, sir. I gave you every opportunity 7 to call additional witnesses, Mr. Yoo. You closed, the 8 Government announced no rebuttal witnesses. I asked whether 9 the Government rested on its entire case, and I asked you 10 twice whether you rested on your entire case, and you 11 indicated that you did. 12 So the time has passed for calling additional 13 14 witnesses. 15 The instructions are nearly complete. We will provide you with written copies of them. We will resume in 16 17 about an hour, and I will give you some time to put any objections to the instructions on the record at that time 18 19 before -- before we begin with the jury. 20 MR. HAAS: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. YOO: 21 Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Coan? Or, Mr. Yoo? No, Your Honor. Thank you. 23 MR. COAN: THE COURT: Let me ask -- if I could ask the 24 Marshals that Mr. Haas be able to visit with Mr. Yoo over the 25

noon hour so they can discuss any questions or concerns they 1 have with the instructions. 2 Can we accommodate that? 3 MARSHAL: Absolutely, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all. (Recess was taken at this time.) 6 AFTER LUNCH 7 (Jury out.) 8 THE COURT: Please be seated. 9 When we broke for lunch, we provided each side with 10 a copy of the Court's final jury instructions. Any 11 objections to those instructions need to be put on the record 12 at this time. 13 Mr. Coan? 14 No objections from the United States. 15 MR. COAN: THE COURT: All right Thank you, Mr. Coan. 16 17 Mr. Yoo? MR. YOO: Sir, I object to the jury instruction 18 Calendar 7, first, second, and third because it mentions --19 20 it mentions ATF Form 4473 rather than the information required to be kept, and I reserve my right to appeal. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay. MR. YOO: And also at the end for the No. 23, it 23 says reach a verdict, it has guilty or not guilty rather than 24 quilty or innocent when I pled "innocent." 25

```
THE COURT: Well, can you explain to me why it
1
 2
    matters, Mr. Yoo?
              MR. YOO: Well, because those terms have core
 3
    differences in -- at the founding of our country, it was
 4
 5
    quilty or innocent, not quilty or not quilty.
               THE COURT: I think the Federal Rules of Criminal
 6
    Procedure provide -- and I know that you pled "innocent"
 7
    pursuant to your request, but I think the Federal Rules of
8
    Criminal Procedure provide for a plea of guilty, not guilty,
 9
    or nolo contendere.
10
              Mr. Coan, do you know if that is right?
11
               MR. COAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Well --
13
               MR. YOO: I still plead "innocent."
14
               THE COURT: Okay. I am going to leave the verdict
15
    form as it is.
16
17
              MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Well, I object and I reserve
18
    my right to appeal.
19
               THE COURT: Thank you.
              MR. YOO: And I will respectfully withdraw from
20
    podium at this point.
21
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Yoo.
               Anything before we have the jury brought in?
23
               I think the parties have requested, and we have
24
    agreed, that 30 minutes is a sufficient amount of time for
25
```

closings.

Does the Government wish to split its closing?

MR. MACHICEK: Yes, Your Honor. We would ask for

20 minutes for the initial close and 10 minutes for

rebuttal.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

All right. Let's have the jury brought in.

(Jury in.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, sort of a roadmap of the afternoon, at this time I am going to go over the Court's jury instructions to you; and then following that, the attorneys will have an opportunity to present their closing arguments to you. And then following that, you will retire to the jury room to begin your deliberations.

Each of you when you retire to the jury room will have a copy of the jury instructions I am about to read to you. You are more than welcome to take any notes during my reading of the instructions, but I did want you to know that you will all have your own individual copy when you go back to the jury room.

Members of the Jury, in any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges and the other is the jury. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to decide what evidence is proper for your consideration.

1.5

It is also my duty at the end of the trial to explain to you the rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your verdict.

First, I am going to give you some general instructions which apply in every case, for example, instructions about the burden of proof and how to judge the believability of witnesses.

Then I will give you some specific rules of law about this particular case.

And, finally, I will explain to you the procedures you should follow in your deliberations.

You, as the jurors, are the judges of the facts.

But in determining what actually happened, that is in reaching your decision as to the facts, it is your sworn duty to follow all of the rules of law as I explain them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule I may state to you.

You must not substitute your -- or follow your own notion or opinion of what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you, regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise that you made and the oath that you took before

1.5

being accepted by the parties as jurors, and they have the right to expect nothing less.

The Superseding Indictment, or formal charge, against the Defendant is not evidence of guilt. Indeed, the Defendant is presumed by law to be innocent. The Defendant begins with a clean slate. The law does not require a Defendant to prove his innocence or produce any evidence at all.

The Government has the burden of proving the Defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And if it fails to do so, you must acquit the Defendant.

While the Government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that the Defendant's guilt be proven beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the Government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the Defendant's guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all of the evidence in the case.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in making the most important decisions of your own affairs.

As I told you earlier, it is your duty to determine the facts. And to do so, you must consider only the evidence

1.5

presented during the trial. Evidence is the sworn testimony of the witnesses, including stipulations and the exhibits.

The questions, statements, objections, and arguments made by the lawyers or the parties are not evidence.

The function of the lawyers and the parties is to point out those things that are most significant or most helpful to their side of the case, and in so doing, to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your notice.

In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls in this case. What the lawyers or the parties say is not binding upon you.

During the trial I sustained objections to certain questions and exhibits. You must disregard those questions and exhibits entirely. Do not speculate as to what the witness would have said if permitted to answer the question or as to the contents of an exhibit.

Also, certain testimony or other evidence has been ordered stricken from the record, and you have been instructed to disregard this evidence.

Do not consider any testimony or other evidence which has been stricken in reaching your decision. Your verdict must be based solely on the legally admissible evidence and testimony.

1.5

Also, do not assume from anything I may have done or said during the trial that I have any opinion concerning any of the issues in this case. Except for the instruction to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own findings as to the facts.

In considering the evidence, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience.

In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts that have been established by the evidence.

Don't be concerned about whether evidence is direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. You should consider and weigh all of the evidence that was presented to you.

Direct evidence is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness. And circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of events and circumstances indicating that something is or is not a fact.

The law makes no distinction between the weight you may give to either direct or circumstantial evidence. But the law does require that you, after weighing all of the evidence, whether direct or circumstantial, be convinced of the guilt of the Defendant beyond a reasonable doubt before

you can find him guilty.

1.5

I remind you that it is your job to decide whether the Government has proven the guilt of the Defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. In doing so, you must consider all of the evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept all of the evidence as true or accurate.

You are the sole judges of the credibility or believability of each witness and the weight to be given the witness's testimony. An important part of your job will be making judgments about the testimony of the witnesses, including the Defendant who testified in this case.

You should decide whether you believe what each person had to say and how important their testimony was.

In making that decision, I suggest that you ask yourself a few questions: Did the person impress you as honest? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness have any relationship with either the Government or the Defense? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness clearly see or hear the things about which he testified? Did the witness have the opportunity and the ability to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly? Did the witness's testimony differ from the testimony of other witnesses.

1.5

These are a few of the considerations that will help you determine the accuracy of what each witness said.

The testimony of a Defendant should be weighed and his credibility evaluated in the same way as that of any other witness.

Your job is to think about the testimony of each witness you have heard and decide how much you believe of what each witness had to say.

In making up your mind in reaching a verdict, do not make any decisions simply because there were more witnesses on one side than the other. Do not reach a conclusion on a particular point just because there were more witnesses testifying for one side on that point.

You will always bear in mind that the law never imposes upon the Defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence.

The testimony of a witness may be discredited by showing that the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter or by evidence that at some other time the witness has said or done something or has failed to say or do something which is inconsistent with the testimony the witness gave at his trial.

Earlier statements of a witness were not admitted in evidence to prove that the contents of those statements are true. You may not consider the earlier statements to

prove that the content of an earlier statement is true. You may only use earlier statements to determine whether you think the earlier statements are consistent or inconsistent with the trial testimony of the witness and, therefore, whether they affect the credibility of that witness.

If you believe that a witness has been discredited in this manner, it is your exclusive right to give the testimony of that witness whatever weight you think it deserves.

During the trial, you heard the testimony of expert witnesses. If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify and state an opinion concerning such matters.

Merely because a witness has expressed an opinion does not mean, however, that you must accept this opinion. You should judge such testimony like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it or give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness's education and experience, the soundness of the reasons given for the opinion, and all of the other evidence in the case.

You will note that the Superseding Indictment charges that the offense was committed on or about a specified date. The Government does not have to prove that

1.5

the crime was committed on that exact date, so long as the Government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant committed the crimes on dates reasonably near the dates stated in the Superseding Indictment.

You are here to decide whether the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that a Defendant is guilty of the crimes charged. The Defendant is not on trial for any act, conduct, or offense not alleged in the Superseding Indictment. Neither are you concerned with the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a Defendant in this case, except as you are otherwise instructed.

A separate crime is charged in each count of the Superseding Indictment. Each count, and the evidence pertaining to it, should be considered separately. The fact that you may find the Defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the crimes charged should not control your verdict as to any other.

In determining whether any statement claimed to have been made by the Defendant outside of court and after an alleged crime has been committed was knowingly and voluntarily made, you should consider the evidence concerning such a statement with caution and great care. You should give such weight to the statement as you feel it deserves under all of the circumstances.

You may consider in that regard such factors as the

1.5

age, sex, training, education, occupation, and physical and mental condition of the Defendant, his treatment while under interrogation, and all of the other circumstances in evidence surrounding the making of the statement.

In any criminal case the Government must prove not only the essential elements of the offense or offenses charged as hereinafter defined -- as hereafter defined, but must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt the identity of the Defendant as the perpetrator of the alleged offenses.

In evaluating the identification testimony of a witness, you should consider all of the factors already mentioned concerning your assessment of the credibility of any witness in general and should also consider whether the witness had adequate opportunity to observe the person in question at the time or times about which the witness testified.

You may consider all matters, including the length of time the witness had to observe the person in question, the prevailing conditions at that time in terms of visibility or distance and the like and whether the witness had known or observed the person at earlier times.

You may also consider the circumstances surrounding the identification itself, including, for example, the manner in which the Defendant was presented to the witness for identification and the length of time that elapsed between

1.5

the incident in question and the next opportunity the witness had to observe the Defendant.

If, after examining all of the testimony and evidence in this case you have a reasonable doubt as to the identity of the Defendant as the perpetrator of the offense charged, you must find the Defendant not guilty.

You have heard evidence of acts of the Defendant which may be similar to those charged in the Superseding Indictment but which were committed on other occasions.

You must not consider any of this evidence in deciding if a Defendant committed the acts charged in the Superseding Indictment. However, you may consider this evidence for other very limited purposes.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt from the other evidence in the case, that a Defendant did commit the acts charged in the Superseding Indictment, then you may consider evidence of the similar acts allegedly committed on other occasions to determine whether a Defendant had the state of mind or intent necessary to commit the crime charged in the Superseding Indictment; or

Whether a Defendant had a motive or the opportunity to commit the acts charged in the Superseding Indictment; or

Whether a Defendant acted according to a plan or in preparation for commission of a crime; or

Whether a Defendant committed the acts, for which

he is on trial, by accident or mistake.

These are the limited purposes for which any evidence of other similar acts may be considered.

"Possession" as that term is used in these instructions, may be one of two kinds: Actual possession or constructive possession.

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing at a given time is in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention at a given time to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is in constructive possession of it.

Possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

You may find that the element of possession is present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant had actual or constructive possession either alone or jointly with others.

The word "knowingly" as that term has been used from time to time in these instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally, not because of mistake or accident.

You may find that a Defendant had knowledge of a fact if you find a Defendant deliberately closed his eyes to what would otherwise have been obvious to him.

While knowledge on the part of the Defendant cannot be established merely by demonstrating that the Defendant was negligent, careless, or foolish, knowledge can be inferred if the Defendant deliberately blinded himself to the existence of a fact.

"Interstate commerce" means commerce or travel between one state, territory, or possession of the United States and another state, territory, or possession of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

Commerce includes travel, trade, transportation, and communication.

If a Defendant is found guilty, it will be my duty to decide what the punishment will be. You should not be concerned with punishment in any way. It should not enter your consideration or discussion.

Counts 1 through 7 of the Superseding Indictment charge that the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, with making false statements with respect to information required to be kept by a federal firearms licensee, in violation of 18 USC, Section 924(a)(1)(A).

Title 18, United States Code, Section 924(a)(1)(A), makes it a crime for anyone to make any false statement or

representation with respect to the information required by this chapter to be kept in the records of a person licensed under this chapter or in applying for any license or exemption or relief from disability under the provisions of this chapter.

For you to find the Defendant guilty of these crimes, you must be convinced that the Government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant made a false statement in the ATF Form 4473.

Second, that the Defendant made the statement to a federally licensed firearms dealer.

Third, that the Defendant knew that the statement was false.

A statement is false if it was untrue when it was made.

Count 8 of the Superseding Indictment charges that the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, with possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, in violation of 18 USC, Section 922(g)(4).

Title 18, United States Code, Section 922(g)(4), makes it a crime for any person who has been committed to a mental institution to possess, in or affecting commerce, any firearm or ammunition.

For you to find the Defendant guilty of this crime,

1.5

you must be convinced that the Government has proved each of the following beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant knowingly possessed a firearm, as charged in the Superseding Indictment.

Second, that the Defendant had been committed to a mental institution before the Defendant possessed the firearm.

Third, that the firearm possessed traveled in interstate commerce.

As a matter of law, Count 8 does not include a person who is hospitalized for observation and examination where they were not found to be mentally ill.

It is not necessary for the Government to prove that the Defendant possessed all five firearms which he is alleged to have possessed. It is only necessary that you find that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant possessed a firearm.

To reach a verdict, whether it is guilty or not guilty, all of you must agree. Your verdict must be unanimous on each count of the Superseding Indictment. Your deliberations will be in secret. You will never have to explain your verdict to anyone.

It is your duty to consult with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement, if you can do so. And each of you must decide the case for yourself, but

only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors.

During the deliberations, do not hesitate to reexamine your own opinions and change your mind if you are convinced that you are wrong.

But do not give up your honest beliefs as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times you are judges of the facts, and your duty is to decide whether the Government has proved the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

When you go to the jury room, the first thing that you should do is to select one among your number as your foreperson who will help to guide your deliberations and speak for you here in the courtroom.

A form of verdict has been prepared for your convenience.

The foreperson will write the unanimous answer of the jury in the space provided for each count of the Superseding Indictment, either guilty or not guilty. And at the conclusion of your deliberations, the foreperson should date and sign the verdict.

If for any reason you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, the foreperson should write a

1.5

message and give it to the CSO, and I will either reply in writing or bring you back into the courtroom to answer your message. I will always consult with the attorneys and the parties before answering your questions.

You should bear in mind that you are never to reveal to any person, not even to me, how the court (sic) stands numerically or otherwise on any count on the Superseding Indictment until after you have reached your unanimous verdict.

As I said, each of you will have your own copy of the jury instructions, and there will be one copy of the verdict form that will go back with you during your deliberations. I will go over that with you very briefly.

It just says at the top: Verdict of the Jury. And then thereafter: As to Count 1 of the Superseding

Indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, also known as Hank Yoo, and there is a space for guilty and space for not guilty.

And then the foreperson will check or X in either of those boxes, and then it follows down all the way through all eight of the counts. And then at the bottom there is a place for the foreperson to sign and date the verdict form.

So those are my instructions.

At this time, the Government may begin its closing argument.

MR. YOO: Oh, just for the record, after I have seen this, I object to the last part of jury instructions, 21, Count 8 also. It should have ended as a matter of law on Count 8 does not include a person who is hospitalized for observation and examination. Period. Because -- because -- because that means this -- this count should be solely based on a court hearing, not a -- not a medical determination by a hospital. And as I have noted before, I object to the jury instruction number --

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yoo.

Mr. Machicek, you may proceed.

MR. MACHICEK: Thank you, Your Honor. If it pleases the Court.

Mr. Haas.

Members of the Jury.

They say never ask a lawyer for a time estimate. I want to thank everybody here this afternoon for your careful attention throughout the last couple of days of trial. I want to thank y'all for very carefully paying attention to the witnesses on the witness stand and the evidence they presented throughout the case.

I promised you during the opening statement that this case would be fairly straightforward and simple. We have hit a couple of snags. But I submit to you that the evidence that you have heard has been very straightforward

and simple. 1 The roadblocks that we have encountered along the 2 way, the snags and the time frame have come from the 3 incessant argument that the law is not what it actually is. 4 5 Well, thankfully, the Judge has just read to each and every one of you, and each and every one of you is going 6 7 to be provided --MR. YOO: Objection. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, if you need to approach the 9 bench to make some objection during the Government's closing, 10 you may do that, if that is absolutely necessary. 11 (Bench conference held.) 12 The Prosecution is not the Judge. 13 MR. YOO: The --MR. MACHICEK: Neither is the Defendant, Your 14 1.5 Honor. THE COURT: Neither are you, Mr. Yoo. 16 17 MR. YOO: I agree. But Mr. Machicek is trying to make a judicial determination rather than legal 18 determination. 19 MR. MACHICEK: I was referencing the laws that the 20 judge read to the jury contained in the jury charge. 21 22 MR. YOO: Yes, but, but. MR. MACHICEK: You disagree. It is fine. 23 24 MR. YOO: It is improper to say the Defendant has 25 argued the law.

1 MR. MACHICEK: You have throughout trial. MR. YOO: For -- for what it is not. 2 MR. MACHICEK: That is my argument. 3 MR. YOO: That is up to judicial determination. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Yoo. 5 6 MR. YOO: Stop interrupting me, please. THE COURT: I am going to tell you this one time. 7 I am not going to permit a bunch of objections during the 8 Government's closing. 9 10 Mr. Machicek, Mr. Coan, whoever is going to present the argument on behalf of the Government, they have the right 11 to argue whatever they want to argue. If you want to protect 12 13 the record, you may ask to approach the bench, and we will 14 get those objections on the record. 15 At the same time, I am going to permit you to make the argument you want to make in your closing, and I am going 16 17 to require Mr. Machicek and Mr. Coan to be very sensitive to not objecting during your closing. If they feel like they 18 19 have to do something to protect the record, they can ask to approach the bench. This goes both ways. 20 MR. YOO: Okay. No objection. 21 THE COURT: And I am not telling you that you 22 cannot object. If you can limit those. This is essentially 23

argument, and you are -- I'm going to permit both you and the

Government relatively wide latitude in the argument you make.

24

25

MR. YOO: Yes, sir.

1.5

THE COURT: And I will instruct you, just as I will instruct Mr. Machicek and Mr. Coan, that if you feel like you must object to preserve your record, you may ask to approach, and we will get the objections on the record.

(Bench conference concluded.)

MR. MACHICEK: Members of the jury, here is the good news, the law that you are required to follow in this case is contained in the charge that has been read to you that you will receive in your deliberations in the deliberation room.

And there is a reason for that. And the reason —
there is a reason why the Judge is the arbiter of the law and
the jury is the trier of the facts. Right? We don't let
Defendants cherry-pick statutes and definitions of
inapplicable laws to apply to their own cases. Thieves don't
do it, drug dealers don't do it, and murders don't do it, and
we are not starting that here today. Okay?

So the questions before you are, what are the facts of the case? What is the evidence that you have heard from the witness stand? And how does that apply to the laws we are being asked to determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty?

So let's look at the first seven counts of the Indictment. These are false statements with respect to

information required to be kept by federal firearms licensees.

1.5

There are three elements to each of these seven counts in the Indictment. These three elements are: Did the Defendant make a false statement in the ATF Form 4473?

Second, the Defendant made the statement to a federally licensed firearm dealer.

And, third, the Defendant knew the statement to be false.

Count 8 of the Indictment has three elements as well: The Defendant knowingly possessed a firearm as charged.

Second, the Defendant had been committed to a mental institution before the Defendant possessed that firearm.

And the firearm possessed, traveled in interstate commerce.

So let's look at some of the evidence and the testimony that you heard throughout the course of the trial.

The Defendant's immigration documents are pertinent to the Counts 1 through 7, in that the subject of the lie against him is that he filled out Form 4473 on seven separate occasions indicating that he is a U.S. citizen. He is not a U.S. citizen. This is his green card. This is his permanent resident card.

1.5

You heard from Special Agent Brian Noack with the Department of Homeland Security. He told you that these two things do not equal citizenship. He told you that he did research on the Defendant.

He pulled up the Defendant's A-file. He took a look at it and ran it through all of the databases. What did he learn? The Defendant is not at U.S. citizen. He was born in South Korea, his parents are South Korean. He does not have derivative citizenship.

The question was raised at one point in time about U.S. nationality. Special Agent Noack told you that nationality means you were born in the Northern Mariana Islands or American Samoa. That doesn't apply to Mr. Yoo.

Mr. Yoo has also indicated on several occasions through the testimony of certain witnesses that he has claimed U.S. citizenship on a bunch of occasions.

Well, that does not confer any special status on him either. It is not a possibility for a non-citizen alien to enter this country, just say a bunch of times or say a set of magic words, and then magically become a citizen. Okay? That doesn't happen. He is not a U.S. citizen, and he knows it.

How do we know this? Because he has filled out a whole bunch of these Form 4473s. The seven that are contained in the Indictment are the ones where he has falsely

identified himself as a United States citizen.

1.5

The first one comes on September 13th, 2016, at Superior Firearms here in Tyler, Texas. He fills out this form during the acquisition of a firearm. He fills out that he is a United States citizen. He signs the next page saying: I certify that the information that I provided to this federal firearms licensee is, in fact, true, correct, and complete.

He then testifies on the witness stand before you here today, and he says, that's a lie. I didn't tell the truth there. But he is going to get up here in a minute and tell you he is not guilty.

He is going to give you a bizarre argument about the law, about how federal firearms licensees aren't required to keep this type of information. And I want to ask the jury for a practical consideration.

We told you during voir dire that you could use your common sense, right? Why would there be questions on the form that a federal firearms licensee is not required to keep? Why would we do that? Why would we say, as long as you tell the truth on these three pieces of information, you lie about everything else, and you can even sign your name and certify it is all true and correct? Why would we allow that? Why would that be a possibility? It is not. It is ludicrous. It is wrong.

1.5

Next we have November 3rd, 2016, at First Cash Pawn here in Tyler, Texas. This is Government's Exhibit 5.

Pertains to Count 2 of the Indictment.

The Defendant once again goes into a pawn shop in order to purchase a firearm, and he indicates that he is a United States citizen. He has admitted on the witness stand under oath that that was not true. He signed the form stating that it was, that it is correct, complete, and true. Guilty of Count 2.

Count 3, November 17th, 2016, at First Cash Pawn in Tyler, Texas. The Defendant indicates that he is a United States citizen, certifies that that is true, correct, and complete. He testifies on the witness stand that that was, in fact, false information provided to a firearms dealer. Guilty of Count 3.

We look at Count 4, same day, second visit,

November 17th, 2016, First Cash Pawn in Tyler, Texas. He

filled out Form 4473. He indicates that he is a United

States citizen. He is not a United States citizen. But in

spite of that fact, he certifies by his signature that it is

true, correct, and complete. He is guilty of Count 4 of the

Indictment.

Next we look at Count 5 of the Indictment. This is Government's Exhibit 6 here, the 4473 filled out by the Defendant on November 18th, 2016, at Academy Sports +

Outdoors in Tyler, Texas where the Defendant indicates he is, again, a United States citizen. He is not a United States citizen. In spite of that fact, he signs his name certifying it is true, complete, and correct. He is guilty of Count 5 of the Indictment.

Count 6 happens at Cash America Pawn on November 6th of 2017. The Defendant indicates that he is a United States citizen. He indicates that his place of birth is Fort Worth, Texas, and he signs the form certifying that all of that is true, correct, and complete.

And what is interesting about this form, as well as the form that pertains to Count 7 of the Government's Indictment, is that the Defendant testified on the witness stand, he told you another thing about this transaction here. He told you he also provided a License to Carry Permit from the State of Texas during the transaction, and he also gave you the reason why he did that. He told you, I did that to override the background check.

Lie after lie after lie for that singular purpose. He knows he is a prohibited person. He was told in January of 2016 from the FBI that he was. He knows that the background check will flag him as such. He knows that is a reality.

It is inconvenient reality for him. He does not want it to be so, so he attempts to circumvent that reality

1.5

by lying, lying to obtain a firearm as a prohibited person.

He is guilty of Count 6.

We look at Count 7, the final count of the first set of charges in the Indictment. This is, again, Cash America Pawn in Tyler, Texas on November 7th of 2017. The Defendant fills out the Form 4473. He indicates that he is a United States citizen. He is not a United States citizen. He indicates that he was born in Fort Worth, Texas. We know that he was born in South Korea. And he signs certifying that the information is true and correct.

And, Members of the Jury, you are going to be able to take a lot of this evidence back to the jury room with you. I want you to look at this certification closely.

As to each of the first seven counts of the Government's Indictment, there is a certification on there, and it explicitly admonishes the person signing that form that any oral or written statements given by the person at the point of sale of that firearm that is not true, that is false, or a misrepresentation, is a violation of federal law.

So at the point in time that he is staring at that piece of paper, at the point in time that he has filled all of those answers out and has the opportunity to stand over it and sign it, he knows, he knows that if he signs his name right there and he submits that form, that information is false, he knows that this circumstance sitting in this

1.5

courtroom in front of folks like y'all being accountable for that conduct, he knows that is going to happen.

We look at Count 8 of the Government's Indictment, the count that alleges possession of a firearm by a prohibited person. We talk about those three elements of that crime, that Defendant knowingly possessed a firearm, that the Defendant had previously been committed to a mental institution, and that the firearm was possessed and traveled in interstate commerce.

As far as the commitment to a mental institution, this is back in April of 2013 prior to the Defendant's possession of the firearms listed out in the Government's Indictment, here is a commitment order from a court in Somerset County, New Jersey that says: Temporary order for the involuntary commitment of an adult.

You have been given some instructions by the Court about what a commitment is, and you have also been given some exhibits in evidence that you will be able to inspect in the deliberation room.

Exhibit 9, Page 21 sets out one of two certifications for that commitment. And the certifications are important because they say that they personally examined the patient. They found him to be suffering from a mental illness as defined under New Jersey state law. And they find that he is unwilling to submit himself to the commitment.

1.5

He is committed for treatment for a mental illness on an involuntary basis. He is committed under federal law. Whether the Defendant likes that fact or not is not a question for the jury to answer. The fact that he was committed is proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

We look at September 2015, the involuntary commitment order. We look at the title of the order signed by a judge from Somerset County, New Jersey. It is a temporary order for the involuntary commitment of an adult, Heon Jong Yoo.

We look at the certifications that accompany that order. The certifications are also contained in Exhibit 9, Page 56 and 71, and they indicate that the patient suffers from a mental illness. They indicate that the patient, if not committed, would be a danger to himself or others. And that the patient is unwilling to be admitted to the required treatment program.

This is an involuntary commitment for treatment purposes. This is not observation. This is not evaluation. This is commitment to treat a mental illness. This is what makes the Defendant a prohibited person. This is what prevents him from possessing firearms.

These are the firearms that Mr. Yoo possessed subsequent to those two commitments in New Jersey. You saw them all. You heard Special Agent James Reed speak about all

1.5

of them during his testimony. He described them to you. He described where he found them.

The Defendant stipulated that he possessed all of these firearms. The Defendant admitted on the witness stand that he possessed all of these firearms. These are the firearms that are subject to the Government's Indictment.

Did they travel in interstate commerce? You heard from Special Agent Warren Keener. And Special Agent Keener told you about each of the five firearms listed out in the Government's Indictment. He told you that he did a trace analysis to determine whether or not those firearms had previously traveled in interstate commerce, and he gave you the trace reports for each one of those five firearms, and he confirmed for you all that each of these firearms did, in fact, travel in interstate commerce from where they were manufactured to where they were subsequently shipped, whether to a distribution center or to a retailer and then eventually to the apartment of Hank Yoo on April of 2018.

You know, you look at Count 7 and then you look at Count 8 and you ask yourself at the outset of the trial, you know, what is it that we are doing here? Why is it important why we are here?

I think if you look at how the Indictment is laid out, I think if you look at how each of these charges comes to be, and then how you get to the last Count 8 of the

Indictment, you understand. That understanding starts becoming clearer and clearer and clearer why it matters, why it matters that at the point of sale of a firearm a person can go in a store and lie and lie and lie in order to get a firearm when they are otherwise a prohibited person from possessing one.

That is the danger to the community. That is why we care.

THE COURT: Mr. Machicek, you have used 15 minutes.

MR. MACHICEK: Thank you, Your Honor.

The last thing I want to talk about, the last form that the Court is going to provide to the jury as y'all go into deliberations is this verdict form that contains the jury's -- the blanks for the jury's verdict as to each count of the Indictment. There is two blanks for each count, guilty and not guilty; and a place for the foreperson of the jury to sign.

As you see on your screen this is how the Government is going to ask you to complete that form. We are going to ask you to mark "guilty" as to each count of the Indictment, have your foreperson sign at the bottom because that is exactly what the Defendant -- what the evidence has shown and what the Defendant is.

The evidence has shown that it doesn't matter how

many times you lie about something, it doesn't alter the truth or the reality of the situation. The Defendant is a prohibited person. The Defendant is not a United States citizen. The Defendant repeatedly lied. And he told you that the reason he did that was to override a background check that would have prevented him from owning firearms.

Thank you for your time, and thank you for your careful consideration of the evidence, and I look forward to receiving your verdict this afternoon.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Machicek.

Mr. Yoo.

MR. YOO: Good afternoon, sir, and, ma'am.

First of all, I would like to address four -- four points of the Prosecution.

First of all, Mr. Machicek had -- had been misleading the definition for a U.S. national pursuant to 8 -- 8 United States Code, Section 11 -- 1101. I am a permanent resident. I am not just like any regular green card holder, any alien. I am a permanent resident who swore into the United States Army back in 2016 and got declined because of that fraudulent record, was not informed of that record until this case commenced.

Second, Lucas Machicek did -- did just state that I was specifically informed by FBI back in January 2016. That is a lie. That is a complete lie. You have seen the -- the

1.5

exhibit, and they have told me general disqualification factors. They have not told me which of those factors they have labeled me as, even though I have submitted to them specific denial code that pertains to my case.

Third, lies after lies after lies. People don't just walk into America and claim to be an American citizen and -- no, of course, not. I agree. I am not a documented United States citizen. However, I am a true American who is loyal to our founding fathers and who is loyal to -- has the full loyalty to the United States Constitution.

And Lucas Machicek just -- just informed y'all that I have lied as a -- a United States -- I have admitted as a United States citizen to override the background check. That is a false. I don't need to identify as a United States citizen to override -- override the background check.

I have -- I have presented the Texas -- revoked CHL to override the background check. First of all, I should have never been denied a background check in the first place.

For second, that CHL should never have been revoked in the first place. That revocation of my CHL was a severe violation of my due process even pursuant to the Texas -- the Government code.

Now -- now, I will address to you why I do not have a PowerPoint that I can present to you all so that -- to make your life easier. I have been fighting this case with both

1.5

hands tied behind my back. They -- I have requested for bail over and over again.

My -- my original attorney said, no, Hank, you are not -- the Judge is going to deny the appeal motion, but that was the case. I received the -- the appeal hearing on 2018 and 10.

Now, the Gregg County Jail is severely below federal standards. I have been denied access to a law library. I have been denied access to even docket access. The Court knows this. I have informed the Court of how Gregg County Jail is -- is depriving my -- my Sixth Amendment rights and Fifth Amendment rights over and over again.

The Court did not take any actions to it. And while they -- while -- while -- while the federal courts all over the country bail out murderers, pedophiles, and drug dealers, they refused to bail me out, not based on factual evidentiary basis but based on hearsay.

I have been communicating with my

friend -- friends, who are bright -- bright about the law

for -- past seven months. And -- and I have -- as a

25-year-old -- as a 25-year-old who has never even been to a

trial as a juror, even a juror or any legality prior to this

case, to represent myself because I believe in the

constitutional rights granted by our founding father; my

constitutional right to bear arms, my constitutional right to

due process, that is what I believe in.

So, as I have stated, I have lived in every single one of those addresses, and I -- I -- I have spelled out my name -- name correctly, and I have spelled out my date -- date correctly.

How can the Prosecution label me as -- as dishonest when they are dishonest about the law? When they are -- they lie about the law, and they are accusing me of lying about the minor factor. I am not an illegal immigrant. I love this country. There is nothing more -- more that would make me proud than to claim that I am true American, true follower of the Constitution.

This fraudulent misentry had dragged my life on, ruined my dream career since middle school. Since 6th grade I wanted to join the U.S. military. 6th grade. This NICS entry has denied my dream career from me. And I have never been to a hearing for it, and I was never informed of it. This is a severe violation of my due process.

Now, it is not the Prosecution's job nor is it anyone's job in this Court, including myself, to interpret, interpret the -- the Constitution. And -- and to -- to I would say, enforce that Constitution accordingly to their own interpretation. It is our duty as Americans to defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic and to follow the Constitution, not to interpret the Constitution.

1.5

The Bill of Rights are not up to interpretation.

It is clearly, clearly defined. In the -- in -- in the

Second Amendment, a well-regulated militia, being necessity

to the defense of a state, therefore, the rights of the

people to bear arms shall not be infringed.

I have never even been to a hearing, and I have never even been given the chance to contest their -- their argument regarding why I am mentally defective when they are clearly mentally defective, I mean, those screeners who evaluated me. Such as Dr. Kaufman over here, Kenneth Kaufman who labeled me on Axis -- on Axis 5 as 25. Axis 5, 20 means you are smearing feces on the wall.

Please ask yourself this: Would -- would someone who smears his or her feces on the wall, should that person be allowed to represent him or herself? Should that -- can that person speak this articulately? Can that person truly follow the Constitution of America and actually follow to the letter and the color of the law?

It is -- yes, it is my -- my opinion, sound opinion based on the Constitution that the Gun Control Act of 1968 is unconstitutional. However, I have not broken the purpose of Gun Control Act of 1968. I have never -- I have never hurt someone other than -- other than self-defense. I will never hurt someone other than self-defense.

But I do have a common law right and the

constitutional law right to defend myself against someone who is trying to kill me, up to deadly force. That is defined within our Constitution, and that is a natural law of a person.

To completely deprive me of my Second Amendment right to bear arms and -- and -- excuse me. To completely -- sorry. At the same time not like to -- like to completely make me not aware of that fact is severely unconstitutional and severely unlawful too.

I have -- I have demonstrated to y'all through NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, where it very clearly states the standards for commitment and standards for adjudication. A commitment and -- and adjudication deprives a person's rights significantly. Individual liberty is at the paramount of -- of this country.

Thank you.

However, to deprive individual liberty with -- with complete lack of due process, that is unconscionable.

For a second I would like to briefly approach on what RUPD did.

Back in 2013 RUPD has exploited my trusting nature and my respect for the law enforcement to completely -- to completely deprive me of my constitutional right to life, liberty, and -- and property, committed a criminal conspiracy to deprive my constitutional right based on a hearsay from

1.5

two people eavesdropping on the conversation of my -- my -- my desire to obtain a firearms license, my desire to lawfully own -- own a firearm.

As -- as several of the Prosecution's witnesses have testified, these are not prohibited weapons. Yes, it is my view that civilians should be even allowed to own automatic firearms and missile launchers because right to bear arms means right to bear arms.

However, I am still following the law. I have not possessed any prohibited weapons. Where in the Constitution does it say it is illegal to be -- to be tactical? It is illegal to -- to have a desire to create your own militia? It is illegal to defend the Constitution against all enemies foreign and domestic? I may not be a U.S. citizen, but I am true American. And I swear this under the penalty of perjury in front of President George Washington, our founder and our eternal leader of this country.

Also, I have shown y'all -- y'all have all seen the codes. I am not just pulling these -- these -- these out of my behind, you know. I am not just making these up. These are the laws. These are what the -- the law -- law states.

Under 922(b)(5), 922 Bravo 5, it clearly states information that -- no, sorry. Required to be kept pursuant to this chapter, and it lists three informations out, name, age, and place of residence.

1.5

Well, in that code, yes. I never disputed the -I've never disputed the fact that 4473 is not an information
required to be kept -- I mean, sorry. I have never
disputed the -- I've never disputed the fact that federal
firearms license dealers are not required to keep 4473.

But the entire point of 4473 is whether this person is eligible or prohibited to purchase a firearm, and the entire purpose of recordkeeping is, if there is a violent crime arising out of this -- this particular firearm listed in the form -- or in the record, it would aid the law enforcement to track that person down to aid in their investigation of the crime.

This is stated in the Gun Control Act of 1968. It is clearly stated that the purpose of that act is not to infringe on the law -- law -- law-abiding citizens to possess firearms for the purpose of hunting, self-defense, or like any of those lawful reasons.

I am a lawful person. I have never, ever actually made terroristic threats. Yes, I have points of view which are -- are very -- very radical. But that is covered under the First Amendment of our Constitution.

To be completely labeled mentally ill, to be completely -- to be labeled mentally ill and to be deprived of right to bear arms, due to my -- my -- my political views, which it arises from my belief in every single individual's

right to bear arms.

The sole reason why RUPD took me to the -- to the Robert Wood Johnson Hospital giving me false pretenses saying: Oh, Hank, it's going to be like a 20-minute interview.

That is the exact reason why I put on a three-piece suit to be transported to the Robert Wood Johnson Hospital.

I did not expect to be in ER. Once I got there, I told the ER staff over and again, I need to leave. I have finals. I have to leave.

They said, no, you are not allowed to leave. And then on -- on those reports it does say, oh, yeah, he is agitated. Well, of course, I am agitated. I am held there against my will when the RUPD clearly stated I was voluntarily transported there.

And the -- and -- and the cops clearly have stated that I have not specifically threatened to harm anyone. That is within the RUPD reports. And even on -- even in the 2017 reports, "death to the Middle East" is a political view. It is not a terroristic threat, but the hospital staff labeled them as terroristic threats. That is a lie. That is a severe incompetency in their profession where -- where -- where they have gone through extensive education for and they are paid six figures to -- per year to do their jobs properly, and they have not done their jobs properly.

Ask yourselves, I have been told numerous times by several different attorneys, take a plea deal, take a plea deal. Hank, Hank, Hank, take a plea deal, or they are going to railroad you. I told them, no, I am not betraying our founding fathers. I am not giving up my rights. No matter what you think, I am American. I am going to stand up for my rights. I am going to fight for my rights. If you are not going to represent me properly, I am going to represent myself. That is why I -- I -- I fired three different attorneys, one court-appointed, two paid.

And I -- after I started to represent myself, I raised over 180 different motions, barely any of them got ruled or granted. Most of them got denied. But not denied as frivolous or moot. Like three of them were -- were denied as moot, but none of them were denied as frivolous. They were denied according to traditional interpretation.

Now, I will -- I will -- I will leave it up to y'all to be the judge -- to be the correct judgment of character for this Court and the Prosecution.

Now, the Prosecution has labeled me that I am going to be a threat to the community. I own a gun safe, first of all. I do not put my finger on the trigger until I have a clear target in my line of sight, and I am ready to fire. I am one of the safest gun owners out there. I have -- I have never pointed my gun at someone, nor -- nor do I intend to

unless I am going to defend myself.

1.5

That is -- that is a lawful way of using a gun.

Yes. Everyone should carry a gun. Everyone. However, as a person who is -- who is enlightened through common sense, we all know what -- what kind of situation is -- is self-defense and what kind -- what kind of situation requires deadly force.

Like, I am not going to shoot a person just because someone punched me in the face. I am going to punch them back. That is force for force. However, if someone brings a knife at me, yes, I am going to shoot them. That is -- that is granted to me even by the United States Code and even by the Texas code and even by the -- and especially by our Constitution. I have right to defend myself. I have right to bear arms. I have right to due process.

However, this everything in this case results from this poisonous tree. Everything else is a fruit. Everything else is a fruit.

As a 19-year-old kid, I did not know my rights. I did not know law -- law enforcement would be malicious. As a 19-year-old kid I had trusting nature. My grandfather was an attorney general of South Korea. He trusted judicial system. He trusted law -- law enforcement. I was raised under my grandfather.

My grandfather told me from a young age law

enforcement is good. You have to respect the law enforcement. That is exactly what I did. I respected the law enforcement.

I -- I have never questioned that they had
malicious intent. I have never questioned their competency
in their job.

Look what happened to me. Six years of being unaware of this -- no, five years of being unaware of this fraudulent entry, getting denied of my dream profession since -- since -- since my years in -- in middle school.

Why would I have filled out 4473 and gave correct name, age, and address and correct Social Security number, correct driver's license number, every single factor that -- that a -- a law enforcement can use to track me down. Every single factor. If my intention was to deceive, if my intention was to go out there and commit violent crimes, if my intention was to use those firearms while -- while I am dealing drugs -- I don't even smoke. I don't drink alcohol. Do you know why? As a gun owner I believe that I have to be in a clear mind at all times if I am -- I am around guns. At all times.

Yes, Mr. Machicek have pointed out that yesterday through Jonathan Hossier, so is 400 Old Grande, would that address be current? No. But, however, I have corrected that mistake at the first available opportunity. When Mr. Coan

sent me those documents to the jail on September 25th of this year, I have mailed them to the Academy Sports, I have mailed them to the -- what was it, the First Cash Pawn -- no, not First Cash Pawn. Cash America Pawn.

And I swore this under penalty of perjury. I have informed the Court. They cannot bring that argument against me at that point because on the 4473 form it allows the transferee or the -- or transfers to correct their own mistakes, correct their own mistakes, yeah. But I have lived under every single one of those addresses, and they weren't like outdated addresses by five years or even a year, you know.

And they could still track me down through my driver's license number. What I did was I walked into the pawn shop and displayed my -- my CHL. Yes. Yeah. I mean, I knew that if I use a CHL, I would override the background check. You know why? Because I have right to bear arms. I am not a felon. I am not a drug user. I don't even drink. And to -- to the -- the letter and color of the law, I am not adjudicated mentally defective nor committed to a mental institution. I have right to bear arms. They do not have right to deny me of my -- my -- my arms.

I am not -- I can't really cite 18 United States

Code, Section 925 Alfa right off top of my head, but it

describes some remedy for erroneous denial of firearm. I

1.5

believe that, to the best of my knowledge, I am not going to come in -- I am not going to state false -- false information as true like they do.

To the best of my knowledge, to the best of my knowledge, I believe that if a firearm transaction is denied, the responsibility of correction and remedy relies on the Government, not -- not -- not the civilian.

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, you have five minutes remaining.

MR. YOO: Thank you, sir.

How can I be committed to a -- a mental institution and get permanently deprived of my -- my right to bear arms in absentia. I was never allowed to face my -- my accusers in the so-called commitment process. I can guarantee you that Dr. Kaufman who wrote that screening process, I can guarantee you he has some political bias against me. He has never even read the RUPD reports. He has never examined any of the evidences. Yeah.

As my friend Jonathan Hossier has noted, yes, I tell people that I am a United States citizen. I am not ashamed to be a citizen or even a national of other country.

So, according to the 8 USC 1101, the definition of a U.S. national means permanent allegiance. I can guarantee you no one has more permanent allegiance to the Constitution than I do.

Through this case it only strengthened my respect for our Constitution. It only strengthen my love for this country because if I was in any other country, I would have been screwed. I would not have had right to appeal. Even with malice of the Prosecution and the Court, I was -- I was still able to preserve my rights by representing myself.

And -- and no matter what the disposition of this case is, I plan to file a million dollar civil lawsuit for loss of my -- my life for past six years.

And I would -- I will insist, I will respectfully insist all of you fair jurors to actually deem me innocent, not even not guilty, innocent, actually innocent, so I can get back to being a decent citizen, so I can get back to living my life. So I can clear my name as soon as possible.

Because even according to the federal laws, the federal code that the Prosecution has cited, 27 Code of Federal Regulation Section 124, it does not state anything about inform -- any specific information required to be kept. It does state about informations that -- that the dealer should -- informations that should be contained in the ATF 4473 form and the manner of how ATF 4473 form should be kept.

The records for disposition -- so the information required to be kept for the records of disposition and the receipt of firearms is actually noted in 478.125. And nothing in there states citizenship. Nothing in 922(b)(5)

states citizenship.

And even then, I still have my constitutional right to bear arms. No law is above the Constitution of America.

No law. I don't care about any other country. I don't care what they do. But in this country we have right to bear arms. We have right to due process. We have right to free speech.

We have right to politically believe in whatever we want. And I -- I -- I beseech President Washington to protect every single future American generation to -- to be protected from political persecutions that I have suffered for the last five years.

Thank you. And long live America.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yoo.

Mr. Coan.

MR. COAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Well, here right before the end, I finally get a chance to say hello and good-bye. I am going to thank you on behalf of Prosecution team for your attention during this trial, and we know that you are going to follow the Judge's instructions and carry out your duty to deliberate.

I want to touch on a couple of things here. First off, I want to remind you that each of you told us during voir dire that you were not going to hold the fact that the Defendant was representing himself against the Defendant, and

you told all of us that you weren't going to hold that fact against the Government either. Okay. I am just going to remind y'all of that. And we recognize that y'all gave us those assurances.

I agree with the Defendant that he is a permanent resident. He may even be a true American. I don't know. But what the evidence has shown is that he is not a United States citizen, and that is what he lied about on the ATF Form 4473s again and again and again and again, seven times. That is what he is charged with.

It is not -- it is not whether he said his name correctly on the forms or whether he said his address correctly on the forms. The charges in Counts 1 through 7 are he lied about his country of citizenship on the ATF Form 4473. He did. He did. He is guilty on Counts 1 through 7.

As to Count 8, the Defendant argues that he wasn't specifically told by FBI the individual code section that made him a prohibited person under federal law. He acknowledged, hey, I was told I was prohibited under federal law, but you didn't tell me exactly which section of 922 of Title 18 that I was a prohibited person.

Well, that is not an element that was contained in the Judge's instructions. The question before the jury for your consideration is whether he had been committed to a mental institution prior to possessing firearms that had

1.5

traveled in interstate commerce. He was. And he has admitted to possessing the firearms. The evidence, the testimony, the records all show that the firearms traveled in interstate commerce.

Let's talk about the commitments. He was, he was committed two times in the state of New Jersey pursuant to Court orders. He was involuntarily committed for treatment. And the basis for that — of those commitments were that he suffered from a mental illness; that if not committed, he would be a danger to himself or others or property by reason of such mental illness in the foreseeable future; and that he was unwilling to be admitted to the recommended treatment program or facility voluntarily for care. Those certificates with those findings are contained in Exhibit 9, and you will recall the testimony of Dr. Larsen about what the process is in New Jersey for an involuntary commitment.

So where does that leave us at the end of the day? What is the argument here? Everybody is lying, everybody is incompetent, law enforcement, trial witnesses, certified mental health screeners, medical doctors. As you were instructed, it is your job to determine the credibility of the witnesses in this case. Okay? I can't tell you that. The Defendant can't tell you that. That is your job, Ladies and Gentlemen.

What I would submit to you is what the evidence has

shown in this case is that the person who has lied is the Defendant, on the ATF Form 4473s, seven times. And why did he do it? To obtain firearms. And why did he lie to obtain firearms? Because he was a prohibited person because he had been committed to a mental institution on two prior occasions.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we ask you to return a verdict of guilty on all counts.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Coan.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, it is now time for you to retire to the jury room for your deliberations.

Each of you will have a copy of the Court's instructions, and one copy of the verdict form will be provided to you.

When you go to the jury room, the first thing you should do is select one among your number as your foreperson, who will help guide your deliberations and speak for you here in the courtroom.

As I told you earlier, if you need to communicate with me at any time during your deliberations, you should write out a message on some forms that we will provide for you, and give it to the Court Security Officer. I will either reply in writing or bring you back into the courtroom so I can address you orally.

I would also at this time like to ask our

alternates, Ms. Davenport and Mr. South, if you would remain in the courtroom with me when the jury retires to begin their deliberations, and I can visit with you about your role at this point.

It is now time for the jury to retire to the jury room.

(Jury out for deliberations.)

THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.

Ms. Davenport, and, Mr. South, you all can stay there. I do want to tell you, at this point the jury has retired to begin its deliberations. You all have served faithfully as our alternates throughout the trial. Your service is not yet complete.

What I would ask you to do is to remain under the rules that I have previously instructed you about, regarding your conduct during the trial.

In the event that one of the 12 members of the jury is unable to complete their service on the jury, it may become necessary for us to recall you. And if that is the case, I want you to continue to follow the rules during your absence from the courtroom.

So, again, don't discuss the case with anyone, not among yourselves, not among your family. Don't do any independent research. Don't post anything about the case.

Mrs. Schroeder has a way to contact you, and she

will contact you, obviously, if we require your services, and likewise she will contact you if the jury reaches a verdict and it is no longer necessary for you to remain under the rules of the Court. So you will hear from Mrs. Schroeder one way or the other.

I do want you to know how profoundly grateful I am on behalf of the Eastern District of Texas, the parties, the United States, and Mr. Yoo and the attorneys that are here, how much we appreciate your presence and your patience and your attention throughout the course of the trial.

As I said in the beginning of this trial, I really do believe that jury service is one of the most important, highest forms of public service you as citizens can render to your country.

And, you know, our Sixth Amendment to the Constitution and our Seventh Amendment to the Constitution wouldn't work day in and day out as a practical matter if we did not have citizens who were willing to heed the call of jury service.

So thank you for being here. And you may -- you are welcome to stay if you want to stay, but you are also welcome to go about your business, and Mrs. Schroeder will contact you if we need you to return, and likewise we will let you know otherwise if the jury has reached a verdict.

THE COURT: Any questions?

JUROR DAVENPORT: We have some personal items. 1 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Richards can arrange to 2 get your personal items. Do you know what they are? 3 JUROR SOUTH: I have a brown leather jacket. 4 5 JUROR DAVENPORT: My purse is right next to his jacket. 6 What would you like for us to do with these. 7 THE COURT: Mrs. Schroeder will collect those. 8 Mrs. Schroeder also has some certificates thanking 9 10 you for your service as alternates. Thank you both very much. 11 (Alternate jurors leave the courtroom.) 12 THE COURT: Okay. The forfeiture instructions in 13 the event that the jury comes back with a guilty verdict? 14 MR. LOCKER: Yes, Your Honor, I will be handling 15 the forfeiture matter. I don't think we have prepared -- we 16 17 have prepared forfeiture instructions. We will give that to the Court. 18 We intend to call Special Agent Reed to the stand 19 briefly. All that remains is -- that is in the Government's 20 forfeiture allegation is the one 1911 firearm and ammunition. 21 22 The remainder of the firearms were forfeited administratively and --23 MR. YOO: Unlawfully. 24 25 MR. LOCKER: So the Government is going to do its

best with the jury's time and only call Special Agent Reed for the limited purpose of establishing the elements of the forfeiture.

THE COURT: Does the Government desire opening statement on the forfeiture part?

MR. LOCKER: No, Your Honor, I will waive that.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Yoo, obviously, will have an opportunity to open on that.

MR. YOO: I contest on every single forfeiture, and I respectfully request the Court to, upon -- upon return of not guilty, innocent, or upon reversal of conviction, that all of my seized items return to me, including the firearms supposedly administrative -- administratively forfeited, but I have never received any notice upon --

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, if the Government returns a verdict of not guilty, then we can address that. What we are discussing now is what occurs if the -- if the jury returns a verdict of guilty.

MR. YOO: And I contest the -- contest the forfeiture pending appeal, and then --

THE COURT: You are more than welcome to do that.

The Government provided copies of the forfeiture instructions either over the weekend or on the first day of trial. I know they were provided to Mr. Haas. We had a discussion on the record about that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
But you all need to take a look at those. In the
event you are found guilty, we will move into the forfeiture
phase, and I will need to instruct the jury.
          So, if you have got any objections to the
Government's instructions, you need to let me know that.
          Okay. We will be in recess.
          (Recess was taken at this time.)
          (Jury out.)
          THE COURT: Okay. We have received a note.
first note indicated that the Foreperson was Ms. Goolsbee,
and the second note indicated that the jury had reached a
verdict.
          Anything we need to raise before the jury is
brought in?
         MR. COAN: Nothing from the Government, Your
Honor.
         MR. YOO: No, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: All right. Let's have the jury brought
in.
         COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Yes, sir.
          (Jury in.)
          THE COURT: Please be seated.
          Ms. Goolsbee, I understand you are our foreperson;
is that correct?
          FOREPERSON: Yes.
```

THE COURT: Would you please stand? 1 2 FOREPERSON: I'm sorry. THE COURT: You are all right. 3 Has the jury reached a verdict? 4 5 FOREPERSON: Yes. THE COURT: Is the verdict unanimous? 6 FOREPERSON: Yes. 7 THE COURT: I'm going to ask that you hand the 8 Verdict Form to Mr. Richards, who will hand it to 9 Mrs. Schroeder, who will hand it to me. 10 (Verdict Form given to The Court.) 11 THE COURT: All right. I am going to hand the 12 Verdict Form back to Mrs. Schroeder, and Mrs. Schroeder is 13 going to read the verdict at this time. 14 Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, I would ask that 15 you listen carefully to Mrs. Schroeder as she reads the 16 17 verdict because at the conclusion of the reading of the verdict, I am going to ask you all to stand if indeed it was 18 each of your individual verdicts, so that I can verify the 19 20 unanimity. Mrs. Schroeder, if you would, please read the 21 verdict. 22 THE CLERK: As to Count 1 of the Superseding 23 Indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, 24 25 a/k/a Hank Yoo: Guilty.

As to Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment, we, 1 the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: 2 Guilty. 3 As to Count 3 of the Superseding Indictment, we, 4 5 the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: 6 Guilty. 7 As to Count 4 of the Superseding Indictment, we, the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: 8 Guilty. 9 As to Count 5 of the Superseding Indictment, we, 10 the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: 11 Guilty. 12 As to Count 6 of the Superseding Indictment, we, 13 the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: 14 15 Guilty. As to Count 7 of the Superseding Indictment, we, 16 17 the jury find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: 18 Guilty. As to Count 8 of the Superseding Indictment, we, 19 20 the jury, find the Defendant, Heon Jong Yoo, a/k/a Hank Yoo: Guilty. 21 22 Signed and dated. THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen of the 23 Jury, if this was indeed your individual verdict, I would ask 24 25 that you please stand at this time.

(Jury stands.)

1.5

All right. You may all be seated.

And let the record reflect that all 12 members of the jury stood in response to my request to poll the jury.

The verdict is confirmed and is accepted and will be filed by the Clerk of the Court.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, in view of your verdict that the Defendant is guilty of the counts charged in the Superseding Indictment, you have one more task to perform before you are discharged.

What you must now decide is whether there is a nexus or a connection between property that the United States alleges should be forfeited to the United States, and the conduct for which you have already found the Defendant guilty.

I have given the parties an opportunity to present short opening statements in that regard, and I understand it is the intention of the United States to waive that right to present an opening statement.

Is that correct?

MR. LOCKER: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Locker.

Mr. Yoo, do you wish to present an opening statement?

MR. YOO: Your Honor, regarding forfeiture?

THE COURT: I'm sorry? 1 MR. YOO: Regarding forfeiture? 2 THE COURT: Yes, regarding forfeiture. 3 4 MR. YOO: Yes, I am going to appeal the jury's 5 decision, and it is my -- it is my rights as I pled "innocent," granted by our great founding fathers. I intend 6 7 to exercise that right, and notice of appeal I file it now orally. And so please inform the Fifth Circuit Court. 8 And while -- while appeal is pending, I contest the 9 forfeiture of all of my unlawfully confiscated firearms 10 pursuant to rule -- rule -- well, 31 -- 32.2 describes 11 criminal forfeiture. I -- pursuant to Rule 3242 Delta, I 12 file a motion to stay the forfeiture pending appeal. 13 THE COURT: The motion is denied. Do you wish to 14 15 present any further opening statement? MR. YOO: Yes. So I object to that -- that denial 16 17 and present -- preserve my right to appeal, and then I do believe that I would like to tell the jury that though --18 though -- though the weapons are lawfully purchased by me and 19 then lawfully owned by me. So those -- since I have right to 20 appeal, I do believe that those weapons should not be 21 22 forfeited. THE COURT: Okay. Does that complete your opening 23 statement, Mr. Yoo? 24 25 MR. YOO: Yes. Oh, also regarding those rest of

the firearms that the Government supposedly -- supposedly administratively -- administratively forfeited, I have never received any notice. It just further proves that they are conspiring to revoke my gun rights.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Locker, you may present your first witness.

MR. LOCKER: Government calls Special Agent Reed.

JAMES REED, GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN,

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. LOCKER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

23

- Q. Good afternoon, Special Agent Reed?
- 13 | A. Good afternoon.
- Q. Just for the benefit of the record, you are the same

  Special Agent James Reed who has previously testified in this
- 16 case and still under oath?
- 17 | A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Special Agent Reed, laid before the Members of the Jury
  here at the table to my left is the Para-Ordnance 1911 and
- 20 | various rounds of ammunition; is that correct?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And that Para-Ordnance firearm, that 1911 firearm, that
- during the trial in guilt or innocence; is that correct, sir?

is the same as Government's 28 that was previously admitted

25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. The ammunition that the Government -- that the
  Government has laid out and is before the jury now, where did
  this come from?
- 4 A. The residence of Mr. Yoo.
- Q. So is this the same ammunition that was referred to during the remainder of the trial that had been stored in that blue crate to my left during the rest of the trial?
- 8 | A. Yes, sir.

10

11

12

- Q. Now, the Members of the Jury saw other firearms that were discussed at length during the course of the trial, four other firearms. What is the status of those, and why are they not laid out during this forfeiture proceeding?
- A. My understanding is that they have gone through another forfeiture process, administrative forfeiture.
- Q. So those have been resolved and no longer a matter for the jury; is that correct?
- 17 | A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now that the jury's verdict has been rendered and has been accepted by the Court, is Mr. Yoo a prohibited person for the purposes of possessing a firearm under federal law and also ammunition?
- A. Yes. Mr. Yoo is a prohibited person and can no longer possess a firearm or ammunition.
- Q. And the Government's allegation pertaining to that includes that Mr. Yoo having been determined to be a person

who had been committed to a mental institution is now also supplemented by the fact that he has been convicted of the charges in the Indictment; is that correct?

A. Yes, sir, he has now been convicted of felony charges.

Q. So whether or not it is this ammunition or this gun or any other gun or any other ammunition, is Mr. Yoo by law

7 permitted to possess any of it by virtue of the jury's

verdict?

A. No, sir. He can no longer possess firearms or ammunition.

MR. LOCKER: At this time, Your Honor, I would reoffer these exhibits for the purposes of the forfeiture proceeding.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. YOO: No objections.

16 THE COURT: Very well. They will be received.

BY MR. LOCKER:

- Q. So can you explain to the jury how these particular items relate to any of the counts within the Indictment, as in how do these various firearms and the various calibers of ammunition relate to the different counts in the Indictment?
- A. These were possessed by Mr. Yoo after he had been previously committed to a mental institution.
- Q. So the Para-Ordnance 1911 that is specifically alleged as one of the firearms that he possessed in Count 8; is that

correct? 1 2 Α. Yes. Each of the various types of ammunition laid out here, 3 do they pertain to at least one firearm that was possessed by 4 5 Mr. Yoo that was seized from him during the execution of the search warrant at his home? 6 7 Yes, sir. Α. And the 12-gauge shotgun ammunition and .45 ammunition, 8 .40 Smith & Wesson ammunition, .308 ammunition, and 5.56 9 ammunition; is that correct? 10 Yes, sir. 11 Α. And each of those calibers relates to a firearm that was 12 the subject of Count 8 of the Indictment; is that correct? 13 14 Α. Yes, sir. MR. LOCKER: I will pass the witness. 15 THE COURT: Cross-examination. 16 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. YOO: 18 Special Agent Reed, did you -- so what is the legal 19 grounds for administrative forfeiture? 20 MR. LOCKER: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. 21 22 THE COURT: How is this relevant? MR. YOO: Because -- because he has -- he has 23 mentioned that other four firearms were -- were 24 administratively forfeited. 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Locker? MR. LOCKER: Your Honor, those have been disposed The only reference to that was for the purpose of of. identifying for the jury that those matters had been disposed of. They are no longer questions for the jury. THE COURT: That's -- it's not relevant to the decision the jury is going to be asked on forfeiture, Mr. Yoo. BY MR. YOO: Am I still prohibited, if I get my commission overturned at the appeal? I can't speculate. MR. LOCKER: Objection, Your Honor. It calls for a conclusion of law. THE COURT: To the extent the witness can answer the question or has any knowledge, I will allow him to answer. I would still view you as a prohibited person. I believe you have been committed to a mental institution and are in violation of 922. BY MR. YOO: If I get my conviction overturned, which was the -- which was the commitment to a mental institution was the basis, doesn't it nullify the supposed commitment?

I can't make a speculation on what the actual outcome of

```
your hypothetical situation would be.
1
         Okay. Were any of these -- these firearms used
 2
    for unlawful purposes other than just possession?
 3
              MR. LOCKER: Objection. Relevance.
 4
              THE COURT: How is it relevant, Mr. Yoo?
 5
              MR. YOO: For the record.
 6
              THE COURT: Okay. How is it relevant to the issue
 7
    the jury is going to be asked to decide?
 8
              MR. YOO: Because these -- these ammunitions and
 9
    the firearms were strictly possessed for lawful purposes.
10
              THE COURT: Sustain the objection.
11
    BY MR. YOO:
12
    Q. Okay. So -- so in terms of criminal forfeiture, you
13
    know, none of these weapons are prohibited weapons by the
14
    definition; is that correct?
1.5
              MR. LOCKER: Objection. Relevance.
16
17
              THE COURT: Mr. Yoo?
              MR. YOO: He is an ATF agent. He should know
18
    the definition --
19
              THE COURT: I suspect he does. The question is,
20
    why is it relevant?
21
22
              MR. YOO: Why is it relevant? Because if I get my
    conviction overturned, I am entitled to get those -- those
23
    weapons back.
24
              THE COURT: Well, the question you asked was
25
```

```
whether they are prohibited weapons by definition.
1
               MR. YOO: Correct, sir.
 2
               THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
 3
               Move along, Mr. Yoo.
 4
 5
               MR. YOO: All right.
               I will pass the witness.
 6
               THE COURT: Any redirect?
 7
               MR. LOCKER: No, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: You may step down.
 9
10
               Call your next witness.
               MR. LOCKER: Government rests.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, do you wish to put on any
12
     evidence in the forfeiture phase?
13
               MR. YOO: No, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: All right. Let me ask Counsel to
15
     approach.
16
17
               (Bench conference held.)
               THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, do you wish to put any
18
     objections to the record on the proposed instructions on the
19
20
     forfeiture phase?
21
               MR. YOO: May I take --
22
               THE COURT: We provided you a copy a couple of days
     ago. Do you have your copy?
23
24
               MR. HAAS: I gave a copy to him.
               MR. YOO: Yes, I -- I object to the fact that
25
```

```
this -- this instruction stated that I was committed to a
1
    mental institution, but, yeah.
 2
               THE COURT: The jury has made that determination,
 3
 4
    so --
 5
               MR. YOO: I understand.
               THE COURT: -- that will be overruled.
 6
               Do you want to put any further objections on the
 7
    record?
 8
               MR. YOO: No, sir. But for the appeal, I would
 9
    like to make that -- that -- that objection to be noted by
10
    the Court.
11
               THE COURT: Okay.
12
13
              MR. YOO: I reserve my right to appeal.
               THE COURT: You certainly -- you certainly may do
14
         And the basis of your objection is that you maintain you
15
    were not committed to a mental institution.
16
17
              MR. YOO: Yes. So -- so if I have my conviction
    reversed, then I would have -- I would get -- I would be
18
19
    entitled to get -- get these weapons back.
20
               THE COURT: Mr. Locker, anything you want to state
    on the record?
21
22
               MR. LOCKER: No, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. Very well.
23
               (Bench conference concluded.)
24
               THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen of the
25
```

Jury, as I told you, in view of your verdict that the

Defendant is guilty of the counts charged in the Superseding

Indictment, you have one more task to perform before you are discharged.

What you must now decide is whether there was a connection, a nexus, that is a connection, between property the United States alleges should be forfeited to the United States and the conduct for you have already found the Defendant guilty.

I instruct you, however, that your previous finding that the Defendant is guilty is final, conclusive, and binding. Because you are bound by your previous finding that the Defendant is guilty, I direct you not to discuss in your forfeiture deliberations whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty of any violations.

All of my previous instructions regarding direct and circumstantial evidence, credibility of the witnesses, and duty to deliberate apply with respect to your verdict regarding forfeiture.

My previous instructions on the Government's burden of proof regarding your verdict on the guilt of the Defendant do not apply to your deliberations and verdict regarding forfeiture.

In deliberating and deciding your verdicts regarding forfeiture, the United States need only prove the

forfeiture by a preponderance of the evidence, that is, not beyond a reasonable doubt.

To prove something by a preponderance of the evidence is to prove that it is more likely true than not true. The decision is made by considering all of the evidence on the subject and deciding which evidence you believe.

Each party is entitled to the benefit of all evidence received, regardless of who offered the evidence.

Preponderance of the evidence is a lesser standard than the burden -- than the proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Your job is to determine whether it is more likely than not that the firearm and ammunition was involved in or used in the knowing possession of a firearm by a person committed to a mental institution.

While deliberating, you may consider any evidence previously admitted, including testimony offered by the parties at any time during this trial.

Under federal law any person who is convicted of knowing possession of a firearm by a person committed to a mental institution for which you have found the Defendant guilty, is required to forfeit to the United States any firearm or ammunition involved in or used in commission of that offense.

I further instruct you that what happens to any

1.5

property that you find to be connected to the offense is exclusively a matter for the Court to decide. You should not consider what might happen to the property. Your task is to find whether or not the Government has established by a preponderance of the evidence that there is a substantial connection between the property and the offense or offenses for which the Defendant has been convicted.

If you find that such a connection exists, the Court will decide what happens to the property.

In this connection, you should not be concerned with who was the owner of the property, and you should disregard any claims that other persons may have to the property.

The interests that other persons may have in the property will be taken into account by the Court at a later time. Similarly, you are not to consider whether the property is presently available or whether the forfeiture of the property would constitute excessive punishment. Those matters will be taken into account by the Court at a later time.

Your sole concern now is to determine whether the firearm and ammunition were involved in or used in the offense which you have found the Defendant committed.

You must reach a unanimous verdict as to each question on each special verdict form. Everyone must agree

1.5

to any "yes" or "no" that you enter on a Special Verdict Form.

The Special Verdict Form has been prepared for you and lists the property that the Government asserts has a nexus to the crime for which the Defendant has been convicted.

You may answer each question by simply putting an X or a checkmark in the space provided next to the words "yes" or "no." The Foreperson must then sign and date the Special Verdict Form as before.

Mr. Locker, do you wish to present any closing argument?

MR. LOCKER: Yes, Your Honor.

Folks, I apologize. Just when you thought you were done, here we are. I have the onerous task of taking even more of your precious time, and I just want to say thank you so much for your attention so far. This is a very quick, in terms of what you need to consider for this, in that you already have all of the evidence before you. And in addition to the evidence under guilt/innocence, you also have the testimony of Special Agent Reed that you may consider in this.

So the question regarding these items to my left is not, does all this ammo fit one gun, it is do all these items relate to any count for which the Defendant has already been

convicted.

So when you look at Count 8 and you see the five different firearms that he was convicted of possessing, you have one of those here on the table and then you have ammunition that relates to that firearm plus the other four for which he was alleged to have -- and has been convicted of possessing.

So the Verdict Form is in two parts.

The first is for the firearm, and then the second is for all of the ammunition. This is not a question of parsing out individual rounds. There are simply two forms, one that says "yes" or "no" as to the firearm and ask that you check "yes," and your foreperson sign and date at the bottom.

And the second one is for the ammunition. I ask that you check "yes" and sign and date at the bottom.

And I thank you very much for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, do you wish to present a closing argument?

MR. YOO: The right to appeal is -- is engrained in our Constitution granted by our great founding fathers. So since I just filed the notice of appeal, these firearms forfeiture must be stayed because if -- Appellate Court is a higher court in terms of judicial authority than -- than the district court.

Even if the Appellate Court denies my appeal, there 1 is the Supreme Court. 2 So, therefore, if -- if appellate Court reverses 3 4 my -- my conviction is null and void, and then I have every 5 right to own these guns. You have convicted me guilty. show your last loyalty to the Constitution by staying 6 the -- staying the -- staying the forfeiture pending appeal. 7 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and Gentlemen of the 8 jury, just before you can retire now to the jury room to 9 10 begin your deliberations on this forfeiture issue, you will have a copy of the special verdict form which indicates the 11 firearm and the ammunition on two separate forms that the 12 Government seeks forfeiture of and two blanks for a "yes" or 13 "no" on each -- on each form, and a place for the foreperson 14 15 to sign and date on both forms. And we will get you a copy of the instructions as 16 17 And you may now retire to the jury room to begin your well. deliberations. 18 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 19 (Jury out.) 20 THE COURT: We will be in recess. 21 22 (Recess was taken at this time.) THE COURT: All right. We received a note from the 23 jury they have reached a verdict on the forfeiture issue. 24

Does anything need to be raised before we have the

25

```
jury brought in?
1
               MR. LOCKER: Not from the Government, Your Honor.
 2
               MR. YOO: I request a transcript of the trial.
 3
               THE COURT: Well, let's discuss that, Mr. Yoo,
 4
 5
     after we have a verdict.
               MR. YOO: Okay.
 6
               THE COURT: Let's have the jury brought in.
 7
               (Jury in.)
 8
               THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
 9
               Ms. Goolsbee, has the jury reached a verdict on the
10
     forfeiture question?
11
               FOREPERSON: Yes.
12
               THE COURT: Is it unanimous?
13
14
               FOREPERSON: Yes.
               THE COURT: Would you hand it to Mr. Richards, who
15
     will hand it to Mrs. Schroeder, who will hand it to me?
16
17
               (Verdict given to the Court.)
               THE COURT: All right. I am handing it back to
18
    Mrs. Schroeder. And, as before, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am
19
20
     going to ask her to read the verdict.
               And, as she does so, I would ask that you pay close
21
22
     attention so that when she completes it, I am going to ask
     you to stand if it was your individual verdict so I can
23
     confirm it was a unanimous verdict.
24
              Mrs. Schroeder.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: We, the jury, return the following Special Verdict as to the property described below, Para 1911 Expert .45 caliber pistol, Serial No. 000210NW. We, the, jury unanimously find by a preponderance of the evidence that this property was involved in and used in the knowing possession of a firearm by a person who has been committed to a mental institution: Yes. Signed and dated. We, the jury, return the following Special Verdict as to the property described below, 458 rounds of unknown manufacturer and caliber ammunition. We, the jury, unanimously find by a preponderance of the evidence that this property was involved in and used in the knowing possession of a firearm by a person who has been committed to a mental institution: Yes. Signed and dated. THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Schroeder. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, let me poll you at this time to make sure this was the unanimous verdict of the 12 members of the jury. If this was your verdict as Mrs. Schroeder has read it, would you please stand? (Jury stands.) THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. And let the record reflect that all 12 jurors rose

in response to my request to poll the jury.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, this does now complete the trial of this case for the -- from the very beginning I instructed you repeatedly about not discussing the case with anyone, including among yourselves, until you retire at the end of the case to deliberate, and then only to discuss it among yourselves. I am now releasing you from those obligations.

You are free to talk about it among yourselves, you are free to talk about it with your family, your friends, anybody you want to. Likewise, you are just as free to not say a word to anybody about it. It is completely your decision, and what you do about that is completely up to you. So you are under no obligation to discuss it, but you may do so, if you want to.

I have a practice in my Court that I ask the jury to wait in the jury room for me once I have excused you. I have some certificates I want to present to you. And I want to visit with you very briefly, not about the case, not about the facts, not about your verdict, but about the process we follow as a Court and your experience as jurors.

And it is an opportunity for you to tell me if there is anything I can do to be a better Judge and if there is anything that we as a Court can be a better facility and do a better job for the public. So, if you wouldn't mind

waiting for just a few minutes, I have to visit with the attorneys and Mr. Yoo, and I would like to briefly visit with you.

I do want to thank you on behalf of the Eastern District of Texas for your dedicated service as jurors in this case. I know how much I and the parties and the attorneys involved appreciate all of your time and your effort and attention throughout the course of the trial.

This is an important case to both parties, and I say this regularly and I believe it more and more in every trial that I have, I think there are three good pillars to citizenship in America: The first is answering the call of military service when your nation calls you and needs you. The second is jury service. And the third, of course, is being an active and informed voter.

You have clearly all responded to the call of good citizens by serving as jurors in this case.

Our Constitution and, in particular, our Sixth

Amendment really depends on our having active citizens

willing to participate as jurors.

So I can't tell you how important this service is to the Court and how much we appreciate it.

So thank you on behalf of the parties, the attorneys involved in the case and the Eastern District of Texas for your service in this matter.

You are dismissed.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

(Jury out.)

THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.

The Special Verdict Forms on the forfeiture matter are confirmed and accepted and will be filed by the Clerk of the Court.

Mr. Yoo, if you would, please rise.

Mr. Yoo, you have been found guilty by the jury.

And prior to the Court imposing a sentence, the Probation

Department must complete a presentence investigation for which your cooperation will be needed. And I encourage you to cooperate with them in every way possible during that process.

When you receive a copy of the Presentence Report, you will have an opportunity to review that and thoroughly discuss it with anyone you wish, including Mr. Haas or anyone else who is providing advice to you. And there will be a time limit in which you will need to make objections to that report, and you will have an opportunity to address the Court at the sentencing hearing.

With respect to your request that a transcript be prepared, I know that Ms. Sloan will be preparing it. I would ask that you file a motion. I do know on the docket you did comply with my request to complete your in forma

pauperis form, but I have not taken a look at that yet.

I think there is some question about whether you are entitled to that status and that, of course, will govern whether that request for the transcript be made at the Government's expense or your own.

So let me suggest that you file a motion in that regard, and we will take it up as quickly as we can.

Anything else that needs to be addressed?

MR. YOO: In terms of sentencing, how long -- how long is it going to take?

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Yoo, I am not going to make any promises in this regard. And maybe Mr. Coan has had a different experience, but my experience is it is generally about 90 days, either 90 days from the time a Defendant enters a guilty plea or 90 days from the time a jury returns a guilty verdict. It is certainly somewhere in that neighborhood.

MR. YOO: I request a prompt disposition.

THE COURT: Well, I can assure you that I promptly set scheduling -- set sentencing hearings as quickly as we can. There are oftentimes motions for extension of time to file objections to the Presentence Report, and I honor those when there are reasonable requests for extensions.

But assuming there are no requests for extension like that and the initial draft of the Presentence Report is

provided and the objections are timely filed, once the objection period has tolled and the Probation Office has made a recommendation on how those objections will be dealt with, there will be a final Presentence Investigation Report, and it is that filing of the final Presentence Investigation Report that really will kick off our scheduling of the sentence — sentencing hearing.

In general, we try to set them very quickly after we receive the final PSR.

MR. YOO: Yes, sir. One more thing. In terms of my phone restriction, I would like -- like -- like the Court to issue an order to Gregg County Jail to allow me to use the phone for the purposes of legal calls for appeal.

THE COURT: I am not going to do that at this time. We are a ways away from that. I am not giving you legal advice about how to file your notice of appeal, but until you are actually sentenced, I think any appeal you might file would be premature. I don't know whether you have had an opportunity to visit with Mr. Haas about this, but I am sure he will do his best to explain the appeal process to you.

So I don't think there is -- I don't think you are going to need to do any work on the appeal right away until after the sentencing has occurred, so --

MR. YOO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I did ask that the Marshals make a

request to the Gregg County authorities to lift those restrictions so that you could prepare for trial. Having done that, I am certainly not going to dictate to them how they handle their decisions in that regard.

MR. YOO: Yes, sir. Also I would like a copy of every single thing on my docket.

THE COURT: Mr. Yoo, sir, you represent yourself in this. Mr. Haas has performed as Standby Counsel. One of the things that I asked Mr. Haas to do was to facilitate getting you anything you needed. You are certainly welcome to get copies in that -- in that -- in that regard.

MR. YOO: And one last question, when -- when do you plan to rule on motion for judgment of acquittal based on statutes?

THE COURT: Well, again, I am going to look at the argument that has been made by you. I have several times noted in the record that I expect a written motion to be filed. I have been told one is coming. And when it gets filed, the Government will promptly file its response, which I have been provided a copy of.

As soon as that happens, I will decide whether I can handle that without a hearing. My anticipation is that I will be able to do so based on the argument that you presented already and the written motion when it is filed.

I will also give you an opportunity obviously to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

file any reply that you want to. I am not sure that is necessary since you have already seen a copy of the response, but I will permit you to file a reply. MR. YOO: Yes, sir. So you want the -- so I am guessing the motion is already filed -- filed orally, but you want -- you prefer reply to be filed through written and submitted. Correct, Your Honor? THE COURT: I think that is the agreement that we had all reached late yesterday and again today in terms of what the parties' desires were. And if I have misstated that, I would like to be corrected by either party at this time. MR. YOO: All right. That's fine. MR. HAAS: Now, Judge, if I may say something. That is exactly what you did say. I handed a signed motion by Mr. Yoo. He said, I will file it. I handed it to him and I certainly know he knows how to file motions. So I anticipate he can do that. MR. YOO: It is -- I have to file it 14 days after --No, you file it as quick as you can. MR. HAAS: I mean, like at maximum 14 days. MR. YOO: Just file it as quick as you can. MR. HAAS: THE COURT: Okay. Anything further? MR. COAN: No, Your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: All right. The Defendant is remanded 1 2 into the custody of the United States Marshal. Pending preparation of the Presentence Report, will be again 3 delivered to this Court for the purposes of sentencing. 4 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 5 (Jury trial concluded.) 6 7 8 CERTIFICATION 9 10 I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true 11 and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the 12 13 proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability. 14 15 /s/ Shea Sloan January 21, 2019 16 SHEA SLOAN, CSR, RPR 17 Official Court Reporter State of Texas No.: 3081 Expiration Date: 7/31/20 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25